

ity, as a representative of the people of Puerto Rico, he has justly earned the admiration and respect of every Member in both Houses of the Congress. His warm personality has endeared him to all of us, and I, for one, hope that the people of Puerto Rico will see fit to retain such a worthy representative for many long years in the public service. His great contribution to our cause and the cause of the Puerto Ricans is inestimable.

In Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, Puerto Rico has an equally outstanding citizen. As chief executive, he has unquestionably performed outstanding public service in their behalf. He is, in fact, a great leader. It was during his administration that successful efforts were made in industrializing Puerto Rico so that more people could obtain more jobs, which in turn provided them with an increased standard of living. The people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States owe to him an everlasting debt of gratitude for the great public service which he has rendered and is rendering. The record of progress which already has been made under his administration is one in which we can all take just pride.

It was through the leadership of these men that Puerto Rico has advanced and is continuing to advance under a truly self-governing associated status with the United States.

On this, the third anniversary of its self-governing status, we, the people of the United States, wish the people of Puerto Rico continued success and God-speed.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 27, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou knowest how greatly we need divine wisdom and strength in our desires and dreams to build a world which has in it peace and good will.

Show us how we may lift and lead bruised and broken humanity out of its sorrow and sufferings, out of its doubts into faith, and out of its fears into joy.

Grant that as citizens of this great Nation we may strive with all the ingenuity and capacity at our command to preserve its sovereignty and security, giving it our loyalty and allegiance.

CI—724

May we have a spirit which bears witness to our kinship with the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5875. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph 1 (a), part I, of the Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6277. An act to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station;

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel;

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day;

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas;

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the manuscript entitled "The House of Representatives"; and

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution extending the felicitations of Congress to the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the 175th anniversary of the establishment of its constitution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2109. An act to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 3338. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914;

H. R. 5512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 6259. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948; and

H. R. 7029. An act to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 463. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California;

S. 1194. An act to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point terminal and ammunition loading pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority;

S. 1683. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2351. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.;

S. 2432. An act to permit the use in the coastwise trade of the barge *Irrigon*;

S. 2513. An act to authorize the sale of Welles Village war housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the housing authority of the Town of Glastonbury;

S. 2566. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes;

S. 2568. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes";

S. 2573. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution to designate the period from September 17 through September 28 as Constitution Week; and

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to make a change in the enrollment of S. 2428, to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 191) entitled "An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2851) entitled "An act to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. WILLIAMS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3822) entitled "An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4778) entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the

House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1093) entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GORE, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7000) entitled "An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-2.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) to designate the period from September 17 through September 23 as Constitution Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1955, as Constitution Week, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, in the conference committee to which I have just been appointed, I shall do my very best to maintain the \$628 million cut in the

mutual security appropriations bill recently voted by the House of Representatives.

I am distressed that the other body has restored over half a billion dollars of the funds previously cut from the bill by the House. I am certain that the mutual security program can be carried on adequately with \$2.6 billion of new money, and that the appropriation of \$3.2 billion as recommended by the other body, is unnecessary.

I have been a friend of the Marshall plan and other foreign aid programs since their inception following the end of World War II. Without these programs, Europe would certainly be Communist today. The Marshall plan, and its successors, have rebuilt European productive capacity, defense, and markets for American exports. I think these aid programs have been wonderfully successful. Because of this very success, it is now possible to reduce our expenditures for such aid.

I was a member of the House subcommittee which originally cut the Eisenhower administration's budget request \$628 million, after careful study of the facts. This year, our subcommittee did not recommend a single penny of non-military economic aid to the major countries of Western Europe. In fact, the bill we reported included no non-military appropriations to Europe at all, except for some assistance the administration has requested for three critical points, West Berlin, Yugoslavia, and Spain. We did, however, make sure that sufficient military aid funds would be available.

A Democrat, I have cooperated in every way with this Republican administration when a clear need for foreign aid funds was shown. I have defended these programs on the floor of the House. My action for a cut this year is based solely upon my belief that the House bill represented sufficient funds to carry out the program properly.

When the administration presented its request for new foreign-aid money last month, it appeared there was a \$620 million balance of previously appropriated funds which had not even been obligated. Of this amount only \$200 million could be legally carried over into the new fiscal year which began July 1. The rest would revert to the Treasury for other appropriations. This was cause for rejoicing, not criticism, because it indicated that foreign aid needs last year were below expectations and new appropriations could therefore now be lessened.

However, the administration wished to obligate this \$420 million before the end of the fiscal year, contrary to provisions of the 1955 Appropriations Act. We were considering that request when on June 28, another \$312 million in unobligated funds was reported to our committee. To accommodate the administration, a hastily arranged meeting was held between officials of the administration and the ranking members of our subcommittee, and an agreement was reached to permit immediate obligation of the \$312 million, but not the \$420 million. The total of \$512 million clearly gave the ad-

ministration sufficient room to deal with any emergency which might arise while the Congress was out of session. No justification for a new use for the unobligated \$420 million was presented by the administration.

Then on June 30, the last day of the fiscal year, the administration announced reservation of the \$420 million for common-use military items, completely contrary to the specific agreement not to obligate these unspent, unobligated, and unreserved funds, which otherwise would have returned to the Treasury.

Our subcommittee promptly cut \$420 million in new money from the reserved item in the bill, reported the administration's breach of faith to the full committee and the House, and the House supported the cut. The foreign-aid appropriations bill as passed by the House, was approximately \$900 million below the administration's original authorization request, and \$600 million below the budget request, because of an additional \$200 million in other well-justified cuts.

I strongly resent the methods used to reserve the \$420 million after the agreement with representatives of our committee, but aside from that fact I am thoroughly convinced that the amount appropriated for the program by the House this year is entirely adequate for mutual security purposes for this fiscal year. That is the real point. Therefore, I shall do my best to hold the House cut in the conference committee despite the strong pressures which undoubtedly will be exerted.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is another Member of the Congress who understands the many complex problems of the foreign-aid program as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Congressman GARY was chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee on Appropriations for 4 years and ranking minority member for 4 years. He helped develop the program and it was the desire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that Mr. GARY continue as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. But inasmuch as beginning with this session of Congress it was made a permanent committee and the rules of the committee prohibit a member from being chairman of two subcommittees, Mr. GARY decided to remain as permanent chairman of the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations and accept the ranking majority position on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The House is very fortunate in having the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Congressman VAUGHAN GARY, as a member of the conference that must, in the very near future, adjust the difference between the House and Senate

versions of the foreign-aid appropriation for 1956 because he understands the bill and the full reasons for the reductions made by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations and supported by the full Committee on Appropriations and the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter; on the subject of The Great Conspiracy of 1933: A Study in Short Memories by Paul F. Boller, Jr., which relates to the recognition of Soviet Russia and brings in the important part of the late Secretary Cordell Hull in connection therewith.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN T. GOJACK

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN T. GOJACK

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

CITING JOHN T. GOJACK

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpoena to John T. Gojack, 1835 South Calhoun Street, Fort Wayne, Ind. The said subpoena directed John T. Gojack to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, on February 28, 1955, at the hour of 10 a. m., in room 225-A, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpoena served upon the said John T. Gojack is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to United States marshal, South Bend, Ind.:

"You are hereby commanded to summon John T. Gojack to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, room 225-A, Old House Office Building, on Monday, February 28, 1955, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United

States, at the city of Washington, this 19th day of February 1955.

"Attest:

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

"[SEAL]

"RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, House of Representatives."

The said subpoena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Roy M. Amos, United States marshal, by James R. Settles, deputy, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpoena. The return of the service by the said Roy M. Amos, United States marshal, by James R. Settles, deputy, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpoena for John T. Gojack, before the Committee on Un-American Activities, served February 23, 1955, by personal service of a copy of this writ on John T. Gojack, at Fort Wayne, Ind.

"ROY M. AMOS,
United States Marshal.

"By JAMES R. SETTLES,
Deputy."

The said John T. Gojack, pursuant to said subpoena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee on February 28, 1955, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said John T. Gojack, having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely:

"Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Were you then a member of the Communist Party in 1948, at any time during the year 1948?

"I want to ask you one question: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"You have left us under the impression at this point that by reading the newspapers you knew that Johnson was chairman of the Communist Party of Indiana and I am asking you if that is the only way you knew Johnson.

"Are you acquainted with Henry Aron, A-r-o-n?

"Mr. Gojack, did Mr. Elmer Johnson or Mr. Aron ever appear and address a group of people when you were present?

"May I ask the witness, do you know whether or not Russell Nixon is a member of the Communist Party?

"Did you take active part in the peace pilgrimage to Washington which was organized by one of the 'front' organizations known as the American Peace Crusade?

"What method was used to get you as an original sponsor? [That is, original sponsor of the American Peace Crusade?]" which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions and, as a result of said John T. Gojack's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpoena served upon the said John T. Gojack.

The record of the proceedings before the committee on February 28, 1955, during which John T. Gojack refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE

"ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.,

"Monday, February 28, 1955.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10:20 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House

¹ Words inside brackets added for clarity.

Office Building, Washington, D. C., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER presiding.

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"This subcommittee was appointed pursuant to the rules of the House as ordered by FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the full committee, and it is composed of three members—the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California, on my right, the Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, and myself as chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. SCHERER, of Ohio, is absent and will be present within the next few minutes.

"After the testimony of several witnesses, John Thomas Gojack was called as a witness.

"Committee members present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, chairman of the subcommittee, CLYDE DOYLE, and GORDON H. SCHERER.

"Mr. MOULDER. Call your next witness.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John T. Gojack, will you come forward, please, sir?

"Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. GOJACK. I do.

"Testimony of John Thomas Gojack, accompanied by counsel, Frank Donner

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Counsel, state your name.

"Mr. DONNER. My name is Frank Donner, 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Please state your name.

"Mr. GOJACK. John Thomas Gojack.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Gojack?

"Mr. GOJACK. I was born in Dayton, Ohio, August 15, 1916.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

"Mr. GOJACK. I reside in Fort Wayne, Ind.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address in Fort Wayne?

"Mr. GOJACK. My address is 2303 Florida Drive.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please, what your present occupation is?

"Mr. GOJACK. My present occupation is in the capacity as general vice president and district president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, union organization that your chairman announced in the press he was out to put out of business. That is part of the reason why I think this whole investigation is a union-busting venture and not legitimate investigation.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you an officer of district No. 9?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is that office?

"Mr. GOJACK. I stated in answer to your first question, president of district 9.

"Mr. TAVENNER. A district president. You didn't state what district.

"Mr. GOJACK. I happen to be elected president of district council 9.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your education, formal educational training, has been.

"Mr. GOJACK. Well, my formal education consists of 7 years in parochial and public schools and if you want to include other educational experiences I will be glad to recite them.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I am speaking of your formal educational training. That was the question. Did you attend any other schools besides those that have been mentioned?

"Mr. GOJACK. I believe I went to school when I was in the Army some years ago, and I consider my 16 years in the labor movement somewhat of a schooling—

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you proceed, please, to give us your employment after August 1940, beginning with August 1940?

"Mr. GOJACK. In 1940 while still unemployed at Delco Products, but working for the union to get this plant organized, I was given a job as field organizer for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. I worked as a field organizer until—

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did that begin August 1940?

"Mr. GOJACK. August 1, 1940, if I remember correctly; yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You had no prior employment by UE? You went there directly from the Delco Products Co.?

"Mr. GOJACK. As a matter of fact, I was currently unemployed; I was on layoff from Delco. Because I was one of the few workers who would get out at the plant and put out leaflets when the rest of the workers were totally fearful of doing this because of the wrath of General Motors, I was engaged to work as an organizer. They felt I had some courage in facing this giant corporation who had sought to keep a union out of its plant.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When was Delco organized?

"Mr. GOJACK. It was organized in 1940 in December. The election was held in January, if I remember. I had been working voluntarily for the local and, as I applied earlier, I received some very modest amounts of money for organizing, the handbill distribution, and participating in handbills.

"If I remember correctly, at one point when they couldn't get workers to do it because of the fear of the corporation, they hired Western Union boys and I offered to work for the same money as Western Union boys because I needed funds to supplement my WPA.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you continue with your employment by UE beginning August 1, 1940, and the various positions held by you in that organization from that time to the present?

"Mr. GOJACK. As I said earlier, I was engaged as a field organizer for that union about August 1, 1940. Sometime in 1942, I don't recall the exact date, I think the fall of 1942—I would have to check the records to get the exact date—the executive board of District Council 9 in the Fort Wayne area where I had by that time been sent by the national union, hired, asked the international union to give me a leave of absence to hire me as business representative of the district council because of my experience in negotiation. At that point I went off the payroll of the national union and went to work as an employee of District Council 9.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let's go back again to the period that you were employed by the UE. The last that you told us was that in 1942 you were hired as business agent by the executive board of district No. 9. How long did you serve in that capacity?

"Mr. GOJACK. Until the fall of 1943, at which time I was elected president of District Council 9, if I remember correctly.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain president of district 9, the council of district 9?

"Mr. GOJACK. I have been elected annually, reelected annually, for every year since that time on a number of occasions in contested elections, with opponents, but I received the majority vote in our district council meeting in which the elections take place annually, in the fall.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You still hold that position?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; the last reelection was in the fall of 1954.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What other positions have you held in the union besides the ones you have told us of?

"Mr. GOJACK. According to the constitution of our union by virtue of that office of district council president, I am automatically a general vice president of the national union and a member of the general executive board. And I have held that office concurrent with the district council position in accordance with the constitution of our organization.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I think now I shall ask the question that the Congressman asked you a few moments ago: Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time while occupying any of the positions you have enumerated in the union?

"Mr. GOJACK. In 1949 and 1950 and 1951 and 1952 and 1953, and 1954, on August 24, 1954, I signed an affidavit which said 'I am a responsible officer of the union named below, the UE. I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party. I do not believe in and I am not a member of nor do I support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.'

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the witness be directed to answer Mr. Tavenner's question because obviously his answer was not responsive to the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. That is correct. The witness is directed to give a direct answer to the question propounded by counsel. As I recall, he asked you whether or not at any time while you have been employed by the UE in any official capacity, were you at any time a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. Moulder, I don't believe that this committee has any right to investigate my political beliefs or affiliations, especially so when its purpose is union busting.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The answer is not responsive to the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I will explain why. If you want to know my political beliefs, you can check the records in Allen County, Ind.

"Mr. MOULDER. The fact that you refuse to answer that question truthfully—would that have the effect of busting the union?

"Mr. GOJACK. Every time I cast a ballot in a primary election I have had to register my party preference and those records are available to you and that convinces me you are not interested in my political affiliation.

"Mr. MOULDER. You were asked a very simple question as to whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party while you were employed by or actively engaged in any official capacity for the UE.

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't believe that Public Law 601—

"Mr. MOULDER. You can answer that.

"Mr. GOJACK. Gives this committee the right to inquire into my—

"Mr. DOYLE. I do not mean to interrupt you again, but you are proceeding again to read that prepared statement. Why don't you come out for the right and give us a forthright answer, an honest-to-God answer, and answer the question promptly and quickly?

"You know very well whether or not you have been a member of the Communist Party. That is our question.

"Mr. GOJACK. My forthright answer is this—

"Mr. DOYLE. You have taken about 3 minutes already trying to get out of answering that question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't been hedging. You Congressmen have been taking the floor.

"Mr. MOULDER. You said 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954—

"Mr. DOYLE. Down to August 24, 1954.

"Mr. MOULDER. In 1948 were you a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. This affidavit is still on file. I don't believe the resolution which put you up in business, under the first amendment to the Constitution, gives you the right to inquire into my political beliefs.

"Mr. MOULDER. You have no hesitancy in answering the question as to 1949. That was after the law compelled you to sign this affidavit. Prior to that time, say 6 months prior to 1948, were you then a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. Congressman, because these hearings were set up to interfere in labor board elections in Magnavox and Whirlpool—

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you refuse to answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; if you let me answer the question I will answer it. I will give you the answer in my own way.

"Mr. MOULDER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in the year 1948?

"Mr. GOJACK. Look—it is not a simple question. When you have got paid liars like Matusow around here and you had a fellow from Ohio that was a lunatic that testified in one case, and this committee—

"Mr. MOULDER. You can tell the truth.

"Mr. GOJACK. This committee took the word of a lunatic and tried to frame some people, and Cecil Scott and Representative WALTER—

"Mr. TAVENNER. Cecil Scott never testified. "Mr. GOJACK. The chairman of the committee said Cecil Scott was a lunatic and altered a document before this committee and WALTER said he would recommend the matter be referred to the United States Attorney.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That doesn't excuse you from telling the truth. What is the truth? Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time before you became a UE employee or since?

"Mr. GOJACK. When you have a paid liar like Matusow—

"Mr. TAVENNER. He is not testifying about you.

"Mr. GOJACK. Matusow tells in his revelations about going into Dayton, Ohio, and meeting with the personnel manager—

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that this diatribe be stopped, Mr. Chairman. I don't have to take that from you even if the chairman—it is a simple question. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct him to answer the question. May I ask a question?

"Were you ever a member of the Communist Party? Let's get the record straight because I want to get this record just right. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am going to answer that question in my own way.

"Mr. MOULDER. The question calls for a civil answer.

"Mr. GOJACK. Not while you have paid liars like Matusow and Strunk, who said this lad was running a strike in a guided-missile plant in Detroit. I was involved in that strike. It is not a guided-missile plant in the first place. I tried to break that strike on that paid liar's testimony.

"Mr. SCHERER. I am directing you to quit talking and answer the question, and, if you don't, you are in contempt. Do you understand?

"Mr. GOJACK. I think it is up to the courts to decide who is in contempt, not you. We haven't reached a stage in this country where a Moulder or a Scherer can tell who is in contempt. I have some faith in the courts of this land yet.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question propounded to you by Mr. SCHERER. You have not answered the question, I understand.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let's get together on the question because that is important.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor?

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. My answer to that question is that since 1949 I have signed these affidavits, one on file now. McCARTHY had an investigation, which the Department of Justice said—

"Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

"Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct him to answer my question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am going to answer your question if you will be patient.

"Mr. MOULDER. When?

"Mr. GOJACK. If you will stop interrupting and let me answer, I will.

"Mr. MOULDER. How long do you think it will take you to answer?

"Mr. GOJACK. I think I can do it in about a minute and a half.

"Mr. MOULDER. That question calls for a simple 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Mr. GOJACK. Not when you have paid liars like Matusow around who frame these hearings.

"Mr. MOULDER. That is enough.

"Mr. GOJACK. I think the first amendment to the Constitution protects me in my right to challenge this committee asking me any questions about my political affiliations or beliefs and especially when it is used for union busting.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you claim the privilege under the fifth amendment now?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; I have not.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question: Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am saying the first amendment to the United States Constitution gives me the right to challenge your committee using this hearing for union busting and for strike breaking as in the case of this paid liar, Strunk, who lied about the Square D strike.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. I will answer the question my own way.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer the question for the reasons you have just stated?

"Mr. GOJACK. For the reason that the first amendment—

"Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer for the reason of the first amendment; is that right?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; for the reason that the first amendment of the United States Constitution—

"Mr. MOULDER. That is enough. Proceed.

"Mr. GOJACK. I want to give my explanation.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I insist that you ask counsel to proceed now.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed. However, I want to—

"Mr. GOJACK. You are not permitting me to give my explanation of the answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. You have not attempted to answer the question. You have been making a speech like an ordinary soapbox Communist orator.

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't had the opportunity to vote myself a \$10,000 raise.

"Mr. MOULDER. Let us proceed.

"Mr. GOJACK. I want the record to show I have not been given an opportunity to make an explanation.

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you refusing to answer the question because Congress voted itself a \$10,000 raise?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; but I resent—and not with bitterness against my Government because I love my Government, although I dislike some of the people currently in control of it from Charlie Wilson on down.

"Mr. MOULDER. I ask you—

"Mr. GOJACK. Some of these other corporations people here are here for the sole purpose of using this hearing to bust our union.

"Mr. DOYLE. You have made a speech, so your members will know what you have said before the committee.

"Mr. MOULDER. I want to resubmit the question whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party in the year 1948 or at any time prior to the time you signed the first affidavit referred to in your testimony.

"Mr. GOJACK. My answer to that—

"Mr. MOULDER. You answered the question as to 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

"Mr. DOYLE. No; he has not. All he said was he swore to an affidavit. I do not take cognizance that the affidavit is an answer to the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Were you then a member of the Communist Party in 1948, at any time during the year 1948?

"Mr. GOJACK. The purpose of this hearing clearly in my mind is not legislative in character.

"Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer?

"Mr. GOJACK. This hearing is designed to influence an election, designed to smear me. You have no right as a committee—

"Mr. MOULDER. You are arguing with us. You have not answered the question; you have declined to answer it.

"Mr. GOJACK. My answer to the question is when you have paid liars like Matusow, paid liars like Strunk, and paid liars like this lunatic, Cecil Scott, around—

"Mr. DOYLE. This is the fourth time you have given those as your reasons.

"Mr. GOJACK. There may be others.

"Mr. DOYLE. Don't repeat those same reasons. Start in on some new ones, if you have them.

"Mr. GOJACK. I think my reason is about the best one I can think of because I love the United States Constitution and I think that the first amendment ought to protect me, particularly insofar as the first amendment doesn't give or rather guards against the kind of an operation this witch-hunting committee is engaged in.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you claim this privilege under that amendment and decline to answer?

"Do you decline to answer by claiming the privilege under the first amendment?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Let's go to the next question.

"Mr. MOULDER. All right.

"Mr. DOYLE. It is 4:30, Mr. Chairman. We talked about adjourning.

"Mr. GOJACK. May I finish my explanation? I haven't finished yet. I mean in regard to this paid liar Matusow, this liar Strunk, Cecil Scott—

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that we proceed with the next question. Matusow was a Communist.

"Mr. GOJACK. Also a union buster. He was your boy then. You loved him then.

"Mr. MOULDER. I want to ask you one question: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I have this affidavit on file and that affidavit speaks for itself.

"Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute. I ask that you direct the witness to answer your question. Let's keep this record straight. I am going to make a motion to cite him for contempt.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question "yes" or "no;" Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"It is a very simple question calling for a very simple answer.

"Mr. GOJACK. I swore to an affidavit.

"Mr. MOULDER. What was the date of the affidavit?

"Mr. GOJACK. August 24, 1954.

"Mr. MOULDER. I am referring to this date.

"Mr. GOJACK. This covers this date. This affidavit is still on file.

"Mr. DOYLE. It does not.

"Mr. GOJACK. It does.

"Mr. DOYLE. The chairman asked you whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party today, the date you are sitting in that chair.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am telling you this affidavit is on file here in Washington and this affidavit, signed and notarized, says I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party and it also has the reference in there to not believing in or not being a member of nor supporting any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. That affidavit is on file and in effect.

"Mr. SCHERER. Who do you think you are fooling? I ask you, Mr. Chairman, that you direct him to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair requests that you answer the question as to whether or not you are now a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I submit it is not a matter of requesting, that you as chairman under the law and under your assignment are directing him to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer.

"Mr. GOJACK. Under the first amendment to the Constitution you have no right to even have this hearing.

"Mr. DOYLE. That is your opinion.

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; and I am entitled to my opinion in this country still, though we are getting dangerously close to the point when Representative WALTER can tell people how to vote in an election.

"Mr. DOYLE. Why do you decline to give an honest answer? You don't suppose we will take that affidavit as the answer to this question, do you?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not going to cooperate with union busters. My union is on record as the UAO-WAC, not a bad union, to fight back against McCarthys, McCarrans, Jenners, and Veldes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you want to answer or do you decline to answer the question that has been asked? Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am letting the record speak for itself.

• • • • •
"UNITED STATES HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C., Tuesday, March 1, 1955.
"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a. m., in the Caucus Room, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman) presiding.

"Committee members present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman), CLYDE DOYLE, and GORDON H. SCHERER.

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"Will you call Mr. Gojack.

"Testimony of John Thomas Gojack, accompanied by counsel, Frank Donner (resumed)

• • • • •
"Mr. TAVENNER. While you were residing in Fort Wayne, was there a strike conducted in General Electric by a local of the UE?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes, sir; there was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the local, the number of the local?

"Mr. GOJACK. It was at that time UE local 901.

"Mr. TAVENNER. 901. Did the Communist Party participate in any manner in the conduct of the strike?

"Mr. GOJACK. That strike was voted by the membership of local 901, the membership

voted upon a plan of strike action which included the establishment of committees for various activities in the conduct of the strike.

"Each chairman of the various strike committees made up what was known as a strike strategy committee. That strike strategy committee met every morning in the office of UE local 901. The entire conduct of that strike was in the hands of that strike strategy committee, the various stewards and picket captains' meetings that were called and also the special membership meetings that were called.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the secretary of local 901 at that time?

"Mr. GOJACK. If I remember correctly, Miss Bertha Scott.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the strike committee?

"Mr. GOJACK. No, sir; I was a member of another GE local at the time, but I served in a helpful capacity, assisting the local in the conduct of the strike.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend its meetings?

"Mr. GOJACK. Some of them, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall attending a meeting on January 16, 1946, at which you presented a letter that had been written to you by the secretary of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't recall presenting a letter myself. I recall 1 incident in this strike, 2, as a matter of fact; 1 in which the local had received a communication with an offer from someone to give them copies of this paper or to furnish them to people active in the strike. There was quite a discussion about this—at one strike strategy committee meeting, as I recall, as a matter of fact, a heated discussion. The strike strategy committee took a vote on it. I was not a party to the vote. I was not a party to the discussion other than I was asked a question about this paper and, as a matter of fact, I recall this very clearly. Someone raised the question about, does reading this so-called Communist paper, I believe it was the Worker, or the Daily Worker, does that make you a Communist? I remember in response to a question saying that, well, I read the Wall Street Journal and that didn't make me a capitalist, and that I personally read everything I could. I only had seven grades of formal schooling and I gave myself an education after that by reading a lot.

"I have read a lot. I am sorry to say that there are certain things in this country that since the rise of McCarthys are now forbidden reading material and I think that is a sad thing for this country.

"Mr. MOULDER. I don't think you need to apologize about your education. You are a very brilliant man.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not the communication with respect to making available to your strike committee of the Daily Worker was addressed to you?

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I don't recall that at all and I might say this: that the lady who took those minutes of that meeting didn't like me at all and on many occasions I found that the minutes she took completely distorted my position in meetings. As a matter of fact, the closest supporter of this woman, one Dallas Smith, who was involved in another incident where some Communists gave them coffee for the strike, and I will be glad to give you the details on the use of Communist coffee in the strike, that this Dallas Smith later went on to break this union and later was engaged by the General Electric Co. and is today an employee in the personnel office, paid off for helping to break that union.

"That union in that plant happens to be in a very weakened position with less than 500 members out of 9,000 workers in that shop paying dues into the union.

"It was the activities of people like Dallas Smith who was paid off by the company and

this woman who distorted the minutes who are responsible for that.

"Mr. SCHERER. This woman who you say distorted the minutes: Was she a fellow union member at the time?

"Mr. GOJACK. She never worked in the shop. She was hired as a secretary. She was then elected to secretary.

"Mr. SCHERER. Of the union?

"Mr. GOJACK. Of the union.

"Mr. SCHERER. You claim she was an employer's stooge for the purpose of sabotaging you?

"Mr. GOJACK. I have no evidence to that effect. I merely stated my belief, my knowledge, that she never passed up an opportunity to do a job on me and how she colored her minutes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have charged Miss Scott with altering the minutes or improperly reporting them because you see before me a typewritten statement. Is that the reason you are doing it? You are anticipating that I am going to read you the minutes of that meeting?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know how many paid liars you have working for you. I know of three of my own knowledge.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. As to what?

"Mr. TAVENNER. As to whether or not the reason for your attacking Miss Scott is that you see that I have before me what appears to be a copy of the minutes?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't see what you have before you. You have all kinds of papers before you.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us that the matter was presented to a meeting and you have told us that the account of it was improperly stated by Miss Scott before I have given you any facts in regard to it at all. Have you seen it before?

"Mr. GOJACK. I know it from other reasons.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have seen it before?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; I know this because Mr. Dallas Smith and the group with him who are members of the IUE-CIO, the only McCarthyite union in America, a union that cooperates with you, you had material here yesterday that the IUE-CIO stole from our union office. You are using material stolen by a rival union. This same union, this same clique, Dallas Smith, who is now working for General Electric as a boss, have used and distorted what happened during this strike.

"Mr. SCHERER. What union did you call a McCarthyite union?

"Mr. GOJACK. IUE-CIO.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let's proceed.

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't finished my answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are not answering the question. You are arguing extraneous matters.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am explaining that I know of this distortion because the IUE-CIO and Dallas Smith had used this in their attempts to wreck the union in 1949 and subsequent to that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are saying the statement is false before you have heard me make any reference to it.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am saying it is false because the IUE-CIO have used this repeatedly.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated you have never seen it before.

"Mr. GOJACK. I never have—

"Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you are swearing something false which you haven't seen and as to which I have not yet asked you a question.

"Let me ask you the question and see whether you say it is false: According to the minutes of January 16, 1946, which I quote: 'A letter was read addressed to Brother Gojack from the secretary of the Communist Party, stating that they would like to donate 100 copies of the Worker, weekly paper of the Communist Party.' Is that true or false?

"Mr. GOJACK. As I recall that meeting—
"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please, and then you may explain your answer. Is it true or false?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't recall whether I read the statement. The secretary read the letter first, as I remember.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That isn't an answer to the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. They asked me if I had a communication. It so happened that I had received one.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You had received it. That is the question I have been trying to get you to answer. From whom did you receive it?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't it from the secretary of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the secretary of the Communist Party of the State of Indiana at that time?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Elmer Johnson?

"Mr. GOJACK. Let me explain my other answer—I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Elmer Johnson?

"Mr. GOJACK. I will get to that later. I am going to explain my other answer. The reason I don't know whether this communication came from any Communist, I have received communications from the IUE-CIO and I have seen this McCarthyite union forge communications allegedly from the Communist Party for just such purposes as this.

"Mr. SCHERER. Are you charging another union with forgery now?

"Mr. GOJACK. Just the same kind of forgery your lunatic Cecil Scott used.

"Mr. SCHERER. He has mentioned Cecil Scott. Cecil Scott testified before this committee I think 4 years before I became a Member of Congress, but it so happens I must say, in defense of Cecil Scott, that what he said in that executive testimony has been corroborated over and over again by many competent witnesses. And the testimony of Cecil Scott was never released by this committee. I have to say that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You made an explanation as to the IUE forging documents. IUE was not in existence in 1946; was it?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; but people who later created this McCarthyite outfit were active in 1946 laying the groundwork for it. Dallas Smith and Bertha Scott were some of those people.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You say there was considerable discussion and difference of opinion about the acceptance of the copies of the Communist Daily Worker or Sunday Worker. I find this paragraph in the minutes, 'A general discussion was held on this matter, at which time opposition was expressed to such a donation and also those in favor of accepting expressed that people can get considerable information from this paper that they cannot get from any other labor or daily paper in the way of labor news.'

"Is anything false about that statement in the report in the minutes?

"Mr. GOJACK. There was a very lengthy discussion, as I recall, and that paragraph describes part of that discussion; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. And accurately; doesn't it?

"Mr. GOJACK. Not completely. Accurate insofar as it goes; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't the report also accurate in that it stated the letter which was presented was a letter addressed to Brother Gojack from the secretary of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not sure of that because if a letter had been addressed to me in my capacity as UE district council president without some reference to the GE strike, as I recall it, there was something on the envelope and I don't know where it came from, about GE strike committee, something like that. That was my reason for taking my

letter along there. As I remember, other people, someone in the local received a similar letter.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't recall. If I remember correctly, it was addressed to the district local.

"Mr. TAVENNER. This minute says the document was addressed to Brother Gojack. There isn't a reference to any other person. Was the vote finally that of 10 in favor and 7 against accepting this type of assistance from the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. As I recall, I don't remember the exact vote, as I recall the strike strategy committee, I was not a member of it, after a very long debate voted to accept the contribution on the basis that they would accept a contribution from anybody and if the Wall Street Journal would have sent out a bundle of their papers they would have accepted that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at the time, at this meeting, January 16, 1946, know the leaders of the Communist Party in the State of Indiana? That is the chairman and the State secretary?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't even know what the positions represent; I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You did not know who the chairman was and who the State secretary was?

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. Tavenner—

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to make a direct answer to the question.

"Mr. DONNER. Will you repeat the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Repeat the question, please.

"(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not at all certain who the chairman and secretary was at a given time. I could answer that by saying, and truthfully, that—

"Mr. SCHERER. We assume it is truthfully; you are under oath.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

"Mr. MOULDER. What period of time are you referring to as to who the chairman and secretary was?

"Mr. TAVENNER. January 16, 1946.

"Mr. GOJACK. As I started to say before I was interrupted by that snide remark from Congressman SCHERER, I could answer that question truthfully by saying that I read the press and the Indiana press often reported accounts of activities of the Communist Party, officials of it would issue releases or get in the press. I might have known at that time who these officials were. But when I start answering those kinds of questions I feel that we are getting to the heart of the fundamental objective to this committee in its operation here. I don't believe that this committee has a right to ask me who I know, what my political beliefs are.

"Mr. MOULDER. He did not ask you that question. He just asked you if you knew who was serving in the official capacity and, as you have stated, you may have acquired that knowledge by reading the papers.

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't think they have a right to ask me if I knew Wendell Willkie, whom I knew in Indiana. I don't think you have a right to ask me questions relating to any political connections I may have, any friends I may have. I think we are getting into the heart of my dispute with the committee here. I don't think you have a right to go into any of this.

"Mr. MOULDER. He is not asking you about your political affiliation. He is asking you if you knew who was serving—

"Mr. GOJACK. Here is what he is doing. He is trying to convict me on a guilt by association basis, and I don't think this committee has a right to indict me, let alone convict me. I think that is a job for the courts in this land.

"I think here this committee is getting too far afield from what Public Law 601 has laid out for it. You are doing the job of the courts here and I think you are usurping the rights of the court.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. There are only two things this committee can do, and that is cite you for contempt if you are guilty of contempt and, secondly, if you would commit perjury or any witness commits perjury, refer the testimony to the Department of Justice. That is all this committee can do. It cannot do anything else. It cannot convict anybody.

"Mr. DONNER. Is the reporter recording the fact that I consulted with my client?

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

"Mr. DONNER. May I object to that, please?

"Mr. MOULDER. The record will show your objection. As I understand the question, it has nothing to do with your association, political association, or any objection you have raised. The question is merely, Do you know who was serving in that period of time in a certain official capacity? Is that right?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

"Mr. GOJACK. Since Mr. Tavenner has mentioned this name of—what was it? Johnson? I recall knowing from newspapers or discussions that name of Johnson as some Communist official in Indiana. I don't know his position, and I don't know when he was an official, and don't know the time.

"Mr. SCHERER. Is that the only way you know Johnson, because you read it in the newspaper? Is that the only way you know Johnson? Is that what you are telling us?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; that is not the only way.

"Mr. SCHERER. Tell us how well you knew Johnson.

"Mr. GOJACK. I didn't know Johnson well.

"Mr. SCHERER. Or how slightly you knew him. You have left us under the impression at this point that by reading the newspapers you know that Johnson was chairman of the Communist Party of Indiana and I am asking you if that is the only way that you knew Johnson.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. DONNER. I want to renew my objection if the record continues to show consultation.

"Mr. MOULDER. Well, also have the record show that the witness has a perfect right to confer and consult with you at any time.

"Mr. DONNER. I understand.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. GOJACK. I want to decline to answer that question on the following grounds: It is here where in this area of questioning that I grow fearful of the use of a paid liar like Matusow, a paid liar like Strunk, and a paid lunatic and convicted forger like Cecil Scott and any other paid informers that you may have and because I feel as strongly—

"Mr. SCHERER. Sounds like the article your counsel wrote for the Nation magazine. I remember reading those things in that magazine.

"Mr. GOJACK. If you will be patient I will give you my next comment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I am very patient.

"Mr. GOJACK. I agree with the Baltimore Sun and Time magazine which said that the Matusow case reminds us that stool pigeons are as a class to be despised and not to be trusted—

"Mr. MOULDER. Those are the reasons that you—

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't finished my reasons.

"Mr. MOULDER. You wish to list some more reasons for refusing to answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. How long do you think it will take?

"Mr. GOJACK. About half a minute.

"Mr. MOULDER. All right.

"Mr. GOJACK. Because I fear the use of such paid informers, who as a class are to be despised, I fear to answer that question and therefore I invoke the protection afforded by the first amendment to the United States

Constitution and I reiterate my basic objection that the first amendment to the Constitution does not give this committee the right to inquire into any of my beliefs, any of my connections, any ideas I may have.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer my question. The first amendment is no basis for refusal to answer that question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Is it your question?

"Mr. SCHERER. My question is—

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs the witness to answer the question propounded by Mr. SCHERER. As I understand it, you refuse to answer for the reasons stated.

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Henry Aron, A-R-O-N?

"Mr. GOJACK. To this and to every other question that you ask me along these lines for the reasons I have stated earlier, I don't know what paid liar you have here to do a Matusow job on me.

"Mr. MOULDER. We do not have any paid liars, neither has the committee ever employed any witness to testify or compensated any witness for his testimony any more than you are going to be other than for your mileage and attendance before the committee.

"Mr. GOJACK. You had a Matusow who has said quite differently, from what I have read.

"Mr. SCHERER. We have heard about Matusow from you all day yesterday and all day today. He came from the Communist—

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know Strunk, but I know he is a liar.

"Mr. SCHERER. He came from the same Communist Party that you refuse to say under the first amendment whether you were a member of or not.

"Mr. GOJACK. When you cite testimony here as the counsel for the committee did yesterday from a so-called underground agent Strunk that is so fantastically a lie as that this woman who was 200 miles away ran a strike at Bay City when Bay City is a long way from Detroit, and that the strike was at a guided-missile plant where Square D never made guided missiles, and when Congressman Clardy used that paid liar's testimony to try to break that strike.

"Mr. SCHERER. We are getting away from the question. The question was did he know this man Aron. He is dancing around. Do you know Aron? That is the only question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I have already declined. Aren't you with us?

"Mr. MOULDER. On the ground of the first amendment?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes, sir; for the reasons stated, and all of the fundamental objections that I have on the ground the first amendment doesn't give you the right to even hold this hearing, let alone ask me these questions.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gojack, did Mr. Elmer Johnson or Mr. Aron ever appear and address a group of people when you were present?

"Mr. GOJACK. To that question and to every other question like it, I repeat my basic objection that this committee has no right to ask me this question, the first amendment to the Constitution prohibits your inquiring into my political beliefs, what meetings I went to. My goodness, if you are allowed—

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this speech a dozen times.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Gojack, you have no right to object to a question being propounded to you during the proceedings of this hearing. You can decline to answer for legal reasons if you wish to do so. Why don't you give a direct answer, a direct response, rather, by answering the question or by declining to answer instead of objecting to the committee even existing or the act of Congress creating it, and answer the questions propounded by counsel?

"We understand your opposition to the committee, your bitterness against the committee functions. You have clearly expressed yourself along that line, but I don't think you should proceed to make that statement every time you are asked a question.

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. MOULDER, this goes to the heart of my objections because—

"Mr. MOULDER. Then decline to answer for the reasons previously stated on the first amendment to the Constitution, as provided by the first amendment to the Constitution if that is your reason.

"Mr. GOJACK. I will do that, but I would like to finish my reply to this one. If this committee can ask me those questions, then you can ask me questions about meetings at which I attended with other trade unionists, A. F. of L. and CIO, Republican Labor Club, then some Democratic committee or itself can declare somebody being involved in 20 years of treason.

"Mr. SCHERER. We are only asking you about Communist meetings. That is all we are interested in.

"Mr. GOJACK. To some people like your friend McCarthy being active in another political party involves treason and my point is that this goes to my basic objection. You have no right to ask me the question.

"Mr. SCHERER. Direct the witness to answer Mr. Tavenner's question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Russell Nixon?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; I know Russ Nixon.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. Russ Nixon is known to me to be a Washington representative, legislative representative of our union.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; we know that. Will you answer the question, please?

"Mr. GOJACK. To this question, sir, and any question about any other individuals regarding political beliefs or affiliations, sir, I respectfully decline to reply on the grounds on which I am challenging the jurisdiction of this committee.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you not realize that the courts have held that the Communist Party is not a political organization; that it is not a political party?

"Mr. GOJACK. Frankly, I don't know what it is in terms of the court decisions. I read the other day where a fellow was convicted in Chicago for 5 years for being a member of it, under the Smith Act. I am not keeping pace with these court decisions.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then it would not be a political party if you could be convicted and sentenced for 5 years for belonging to it. It is a criminal conspiracy as much as any other conspiracy on the Federal criminal statutes.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. SCHERER, may I supplement your observation by saying, assuming that the finding of the Federal court was according to the evidence and law, it would mean that this committee could not possibly be inquiring into your political affiliations when we are asking you whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party, because the court has held that the Communist Party is not a legitimate political party, as I understand Mr. SCHERER's observation.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I am neither a lawyer nor a Government expert on this question. I remember reading in the New York Times the other day where A. MULDER, one of your fellow Congressmen from Brooklyn, said that under this new law to outlaw Communists, the Communist Control Act of 1954, the one that HUMPHREY tacked some amendments onto—according to that one, he stated President Eisenhower could be proven a Communist. I don't know what the legal—

"Mr. DOYLE. May I just sincerely observe, Mr. Gojack, you may not be a lawyer, but you are a very able and very well read young man, apparently. You are a very well informed labor-union leader. I say that because that is my impression from your testimony. You do not need to apologize for not being well read and well informed, because manifestly you are, and you are a very able witness, very, very well informed in all the areas in which you are being questioned.

"Mr. GOJACK. Thank you, Mr. DOYLE.

"Mr. SCHERER. The question still is—

"Mr. MOULDER. May I ask the witness, Do you know whether or not Russell Nixon is a member of the Communist Party? I am just asking whether or not you know that.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir—

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you or do you not know? I am not asking you to state whether or not he is, but whether or not you know.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I respectfully submit that that question cannot be propounded to me by this committee because it seeks to expose someone, and I don't think that the law under which this committee operates was set up for exposure purposes. My understanding is that that is what the courts are for, to expose people.

"Mr. SCHERER. Their job is to judge, not to expose. It is the job of this committee to expose Communists. That is one of its primary duties, to expose Communists and the nature of the infiltration of the Communist conspiracy in every activity and agency of American life, which includes labor unions.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer that question?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes, sir; on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I suggest that he be directed to answer.

"Mr. DOYLE. I move he be directed to answer, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I respectfully decline on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have volunteered that you engaged in many meetings in what you have termed in behalf of peace. You are familiar with the Communist Party line, I suppose, with regard to the Stockholm peace appeal and various others that followed it; are you not? You are not?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not even sure what you mean by the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take an active part in the peace pilgrimage to Washington which was organized by one of the front organizations known as the American Peace Crusade?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, on this and all other questions that deal with my activity in any organizations, political or otherwise, what I think, how I feel, what I did about peace, whether I went on a specific delegation or not, and with whom—to all such questions I must respectfully decline to answer on the ground that the first amendment to the Constitution does not give the committee the right to pry into my beliefs.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Gojack, you are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I respectfully decline to answer for the reasons stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I want to make it clear, Mr. Gojack, that I am not interested at all in what your beliefs or opinions were about those matters. What I am interested in is the extent to which the Communist Party was engaged in manipulating peace moves in this country in behalf of a foreign power. That is what I am interested in. My questioning of you is to determine what knowledge or information you had on the subject.

"Mr. MOULDER. May I say, Mr. Tavenner, in connection with your statement, that the

so-called peace moves on the part of the Soviet Union were being instigated over here as propaganda so as to prevent any opposition to their aggression and domination of the free world.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I add to those two fine statements that I am also interested in knowing what the witness knows about the extent to which the American Communist Party, in connection with these peace moves or otherwise, was using the leadership of American labor unions, especially any labor union that the witness might have been a member of at that time or had any connection with. The question is the extent to which the Communist Party had infiltrated American labor unions, if you know anything about it, the extent to which they were using it then and are using it now for their conspiratorial purposes.

"That is all, Mr. Counsel.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The documents which I handed you have dates which are very significant. The letter from Mr. Nixon was on March 27, which was after the so-called peace pilgrimage to Washington, which occurred on March 15; but the letter which he enclosed from the Communist-dominated outfit in Paris was dated February 16, 1951. Normally it would have been expected to have been disseminated before your peace pilgrimage here.

"May I ask you whether or not that letter had any influence upon your action then or later?

"Mr. GOJACK. Which letter are you referring to?

"Mr. TAVENNER. The letter from Mr. Nixon.

"Mr. GOJACK. The letter from Mr. Nixon had no influence on any actions I took with regard to peace. I have acted on my own initiative on that question—letters to the editor at home, and delegations, and many activities.

"Mr. TAVENNER. If you have disseminated among all your unions, representing thousands of members, this propaganda document from Paris, then you were performing a substantial chore for the Communist Party; weren't you?

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I didn't testify that I circulated that. I testified that I remember vaguely that on one such communication from some trade union in Europe, which I showed around to people whom I met in my work, someone asked me if they could have extra copies of that. I remember mimeographing that. I am not at all certain—I didn't testify that it was this thing here, and it wouldn't have been circulated to thousands, sir. If it were a matter of something that came from our Washington office or our national office and didn't go directly to the locals, we sent it to about 25 local unions. Then the local unions themselves decided what to do with it, whether to file it, read it at a meeting, or throw it in a wastebasket.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now I hand you the February 1, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker, at least a photostatic copy of it. It relates to the American Peace Crusade. It gives the names of those who were the initial sponsors of it. I will ask you to state whether or not there appears among the list of sponsors the name of John Gojack, international vice president, UERMWA, Fort Wayne, Ind.

"(Document handed to the witness.)

"Mr. GOJACK. This document appears to be a photostat of the paper you described, with the notation that 65 notables—

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please? Your statement is not responsive to my question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am sorry.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The question is: Will you examine to see whether or not your name is listed as one of the original sponsors of that organization?

"Mr. GOJACK. On this paper you show me, this photostat, rather, my name is listed down there.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Does there not appear above your name the statement, 'Other original sponsors include'?

"Mr. GOJACK. After a listing of Thomas Mann, the Nobel Prize winner, four Protestant bishops and leading scientists, writers, Negro leaders, and trade unionists, the language appears which you read on the paper you handed me: 'Other initial sponsors include.'

"Mr. TAVENNER. Does your name appear among those included as original sponsors?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; on this document here, my name appears along with some A. F. or L. and CIO leaders, also.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I know. That is a voluntary statement by you. What I want to find out is, who solicited you as one of the original sponsors?

"Mr. GOJACK. On that question, sir, I respectfully decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What method was used to get you as an original sponsor?

"Mr. GOJACK. I respectfully decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously stated.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the last question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I respectfully decline to answer for the reasons stated, Mr. Chairman."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said John T. Gojack, relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer questions, namely:

"Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Were you then a member of the Communist Party in 1948, at any time during the year 1948?

"I want to ask you one question: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"You have left us under the impression at this point that by reading the newspapers you knew that Johnson was chairman of the Communist Party of Indiana, and I am asking you if that is the only way that you knew Johnson.

"Are you acquainted with Henry Aron, A-R-O-N?

"Mr. Gojack, did Mr. Elmer Johnson or Mr. Aron ever appear and address a group of people when you were present?

"May I ask the witness, do you know whether or not Russell Nixon is a member of the Communist Party?

"Did you take active part in the peace pilgrimage to Washington which was organized by one of the 'front' organizations known as the American Peace Crusade?

"What method was used to get you as an original sponsor? [That is, original sponsor of the American Peace Crusade.]"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpoena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony, and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the report be dispensed with and that it be ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 315) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of John Thomas Gojack to answer questions before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said John Thomas Gojack may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE DEFENSE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) to authorize the States to organize and maintain State Defense Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas kindly explain the purpose of this proposed legislation?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill authorizes the States to maintain a State Guard. During the period of the war when the National Guard was in Federal service the State Guard was organized in, I think, all of the States. After the return of the National Guard the State Guard ceased to exist. This permits the maintenance of a State Guard in the States to be available in the event the National Guard is called back to duty and to be trained and to be at the disposal of the Government.

This provision was included in the original bill we had here in connection with the Reserves. When the National Guard and other matters were removed from that bill this went out with it. Full hearings were held in connection with the bill, and it has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MARTIN. Was it reported unanimously?

Mr. KILDAY. It was reported unanimously by the committee; yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why was it taken out of the other bill? Was that to make the other bill more palatable, so that it would be easier to pass it in the House?

Mr. KILDAY. That bill was reduced to nothing more than the Reserves. Everything with reference to any other provision except the Reserves was removed from that bill. This is not part of the Reserves, therefore it was removed.

Mr. GROSS. But it was taken out of the other bill in order that the bill passed yesterday would be approved by the House; is not that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not believe that is a fair appraisal of the action in removing

it. I think it was removed because of the decision to confine that bill to the Reserves, and this is not part of the Reserves.

Mr. GROSS. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must object to the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2109) to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 4, insert:

"Sec. 5. The authority contained in this act shall expire 2 years from and after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely makes this bill a temporary 2-year bill rather than permanent legislation. The Committee on Armed Services this morning unanimously agreed to this change.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 157) to establish a Commission on Government Security.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, be taken from the Speaker's table and recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has asked unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. This is the bill to which I objected a moment ago?

Mr. VINSON. No; not at all. This is the first Reserves bill. It is on the Speaker's table. I am asking unanimous consent that it be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in my weekly newsletter to constituents on June 20, I wrote of the Geneva Conference, then several weeks ahead, I said:

These conferences will become historically significant. There won't be any world-shaking documents or agreements. The real value * * * will be intangible, for the time being. In President Eisenhower we have a shrewd and astute representative who can read between the lines, see the shape of things to come. He will leave Geneva with a pretty clear picture, he will have in his mind a blueprint of procedure as America continues on the road to universal peace and prosperity under American leadership. We can rest assured this meeting will not be another Yalta or Potsdam. * * * I predict our leader will leave Geneva with the blue chips in his pocket. Moscow will fail in its effort to brand the United States as the enemy of peace.

That my predictions were true, that Mr. Eisenhower has returned from Geneva with a great victory to our credit is clearly shown by the editorial expressions of most of our leading newspapers. One of the best of these editorials, I think, is the one appearing in the Indianapolis Star of July 25. It follows:

GENERAL IKE: MASTER STRATEGIST

Whatever else the summit conference may or may not produce it displayed to the fullest the amazing talent for maneuver of a previ-

ously untried statesman on the world scene. President Eisenhower met the Muscovites on their chosen field of battle, blunted the end of their peace offensive, made them shoulder the blame for the Geneva deadlock, and then drove their propaganda battalions from the field with his magnificently timed offer of total and unlimited inspection of armaments by Russia and the United States.

Because of Ike's leadership, Geneva is beginning to shape up as the biggest—not to say the first—victory we have ever scored against the Reds at the conference table. The chances are a million to one against the Reds accepting this plan. It would tear down the Iron Curtain. It would expose to the world the shabbiness and the weariness that lie behind the "monolithic" facade of the police state. It would give Soviet citizens contact with free people. The myth that Russia needs a slave system because of threats by the wicked Western imperialists would be demolished.

So, the first reaction by the Reds indicates that they will try to pigeonhole the plan in some committee while hesitating to reject it outright. Nobody in the world will be fooled by this. The Reds wanted a meeting of the "heads of state" precisely because they thought they could get us over a propaganda barrel with all sorts of phony peace resolutions. It is they who are now over a barrel—and there is the laughable prospect that Messrs. Bulganin, Khrushchev, and Molotov may have to cable back to Moscow for instructions from their superiors to get them off the hook.

This has turned out to be some conference. We have not given away one single country or compromised a vital principle. No ally has been betrayed—like China at Yalta—and no ally has succumbed to Red blandishments. Real peace is nearer because General Ike remembered that attack is the best defense.

COST OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a short table, which I hope the Members will read, which will give authoritative information as to the cost of gas to the consumers, which I feel sure will be of interest in considering the natural gas bill when it comes before this body. It gives the facts as to the cost of natural gas to the consumers covering 10 of the largest cities in the United States.

I hope each Member will carefully study this table.

Average price paid for gas by residential consumers in 1954

City	Service area	Average residential gas bill for 1954	Expense of utility service for transportation and distribution	Amount paid to producers for gas consumed			Producer's percent of consumer's average cost
				Per year	Per month	Per day	
		Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Cents	Cents	Percent
New York	Consolidated Edison	50.64	48.93	1.71	14	0.5	3.4
Baltimore	Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Company of Baltimore	65.72	60.28	5.44	45	1.5	8.3
St. Louis	Laclede Gas Co.	78.87	71.76	7.11	59	1.9	9.0
Detroit	Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.	86.46	78.03	8.43	70	2.3	9.8
Milwaukee	Milwaukee Gas Light Co.	78.80	73.59	5.21	43	1.4	6.6
Minneapolis	Minneapolis Gas Co.	116.08	101.43	14.65	122	4.0	12.6
Suburban Philadelphia	Philadelphia Electric Co.	113.52	107.70	5.82	48	1.6	5.1
Newark	Public Service Electric & Gas Co.	59.86	57.02	2.84	24	.8	4.7
Washington, D. C.	Washington Gas Light Co.	103.59	94.01	9.58	80	2.6	9.2
Chicago	Peoples Gas Light Co.	54.06	48.60	5.46	45	1.5	10.1

Sources: Annual reports to stockholders; insurance reports of distributing utilities; annual reports of distributing utilities to State regulatory commissions; annual reports of pipeline companies to Federal Power Commission.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. ROLAND KINZER

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret and a sense of deep personal loss that I must inform the Members of this House of the death of my predecessor, John Roland Kinzer, who departed this life at his home in Lancaster, Pa., early this morning at the age of 81.

Mr. Kinzer was first elected to the House to fill the vacancy created by the death of William W. Greist and served in this body with honor and distinction from January 28, 1930, to January 3, 1947, when, following his decision not to seek reelection, he returned to his home in Lancaster, Pa., where he resumed the practice of law. Mr. Kinzer was born on a farm in Lancaster County, Pa., and following an education in the public schools, graduated from Franklin and Marshall College and was admitted to the Lancaster County bar in 1900.

His marriage to Bertha Snyder brought to his side a devoted wife and confidante who was his constant inspiration throughout their married life, which was terminated by her death a few years ago. He is survived by two brothers: Theodore, with whom he lived, and Dr. H. C. Kinzer, a practicing physician in Lancaster.

Congressman Kinzer represented that type of conservative thinking and living to which the Ninth District of Pennsylvania has always been dedicated. He gave to public office the fullest measure of dedicated service and earned for himself the respect of a constituency who appreciate those qualities in its elected officials. I shall always be indebted to him for his friendly counsel and advice, and in his passing I know that I have lost a stalwart friend and this House has lost one of its most distinguished former Members. I am sure that you will join with me in extending condolences to his bereaved brothers.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAGUE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in expressing the keenest regret at the death of J. Roland Kinzer. He was my personal friend for many years, and was beloved by all of us who were privileged to serve with him. Roland Kinzer was a man of the highest integrity, a man of great ability, and one of those solid Americans who have done so much to build up this country. His passing is a loss not only for the people who loved to bestow honors upon him but for his State and the Nation. I extend to his family my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. DAGUE. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permis-

sion to extend their remarks on the life and service of the late J. Roland Kinzer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of my very good friend, and our former colleague, John Roland Kinzer, who died at the age of 81 in Lancaster, Pa. Our State has lost one of its finest citizens.

Mr. Kinzer served in Congress from 1930 until his retirement in 1947. He was an honest, conscientious, and loyal legislator. His work in the House of Representatives was useful and constructive and his ambition was to preserve the principles and ideals of our great Nation.

He was a humble and kindly man and one whom you admired as a companion and a friend. He was always considerate of everybody and the kind of man who added much to our daily lives, with a kind word for everyone.

Today it is with a feeling of sadness that we record his passing, and remember him for the many little acts of kindness that marked his friendship and good will toward all of us who knew him.

CHINESE COMMUNIST SITUATION

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest against the possibility of our having any negotiations of any kind and for any purpose with the illegitimate, Communist, so-called People's Government of China, unless the legitimate Nationalist Government is present and participating in those negotiations.

If we have negotiations behind the back of the Nationalist Government, we inevitably legitimate the Communist government of China and will default on every commitment we have ever made to the Nationalist Government. Our treatment of the Nationalist Government of China has been poor enough at best.

Last January we adopted a policy of defending Formosa and the Pescadores, and taking all steps fairly incidental thereto. This policy was a sound one concurred in with only insignificant dissent in House and Senate. The policy has been successful up to this point and there is no reason whatever to weaken on it now.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], for the statement he made a few moments ago expressing

his unswerving opposition to the restoration, in conference, of approximately half a billion dollars to the foreign giveaway bill. I simply want to assure the gentleman from Virginia for what it may be worth, that I will be most happy to stay here with him until Christmas if necessary to stop the restoration of those funds.

MOUNT CHOCORUA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, much as we all respect President Eisenhower, we disapprove of the misguided enthusiasm on the part of a few New Hampshire legislators to change the name of a famous mountain in that State and rechristen it "Mount Eisenhower."

The President who is well schooled in tradition would be embarrassed by this suggestion to change well-known name places at will even though well intended and in his honor.

Mount Chocorua in New Hampshire has been known for decades to millions of tourists who carry with them the legend of the Indian chieftain who defiantly sacrificed his own life rather than submit to the palefaces who invaded his paradise. Old Indian names are a part of our color heritage. To abandon them at the caprice of the moment would be to sacrifice everything in the past just for the whim of the day.

We have enough changes going on around us as it is, without unsettling everything. We do not have to imitate the celebrated novel "1984" where one of the ministries of a totalitarian state was kept busy changing the record of the past to conform to the political needs of the day. We have many beautiful names in our national parks and forests commemorating personages and events of rich past. These should not be disturbed.

Then the policy of the United States Board on Geographic Names, Department of the Interior, is opposed to such tinkering with tradition. And the New Hampshire House of Representatives will be commended for rejecting this proposal.

The following editorial appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on Thursday, July 21, 1955. Also included is a letter from the Department of the Interior.

KEEP CHOCORUA

To thousands of greater Lynn residents who, through the four seasons, journey through Chocorua on their way to the White Mountains, the sight of Mount Chocorua is a previous landmark.

The resolution of Representative WILLIAM T. ROBERTSON, Republican, Gilmanton, of New Hampshire to rename Mount Chocorua for President Eisenhower and at the same time "destroy a grisly Indian legend" will not meet with approval in our own area.

With all due respect to the President, renaming the picturesque mountain to Mount Eisenhower would be a distinct disservice to the Granite State.

If the practice of renaming landmarks to honor national figures grows in legislative favor in New Hampshire, soon there would be no Echo Lake or White Horse Ledge in North Conway, no Old Man of the Mountains, no Flume, no Lost River, no Glen Ellis Falls, no Crawford Notch.

No matter how "grisly" is the Indian legend of Chocorua—the chief who slew every member of a white man's family to avenge the death of his son who was entrusted to its care—the changing of the name of "the Matterhorn of New England" would gain no additional respect for the President, nor would it add to the lore which is so much an interesting part of New Hampshire.

UNITED STATES

BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1955.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: In reply to your letter of July 21, enclosing a clipping, the proposal to rename Mount Chocorua for President Eisenhower would not be favored by this Board.

The Board does not entertain proposals for changes of well established names unless they are unsatisfactory as names, for such reasons as duplication. Continually changing geographic names would give rise to endless confusion. The name Mount Chocorua is, to my personal knowledge, firmly and widely established. Further, the Board does not entertain proposals to apply the names of living persons to natural features in this country, as you will note from the enclosed policy statement. While this may appear unduly restrictive, its wisdom has been demonstrated repeatedly and much embarrassment to all concerned has been avoided in countless instances.

Sincerely yours,

MEREDITH F. BURRILL,
Executive Secretary.

UNITED STATES

BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR APPLYING NAMES OF PERSONS TO NATURAL FEATURES

This statement of policy is for the guidance of the Board in deciding cases and for the guidance of organizations and individuals who propose personal names for natural features. The policy with reference to place names in Antarctica is stated elsewhere.

It should be understood that the various factors involved in the policy outlined below are relative. Peaks which are major features in eastern United States would be secondary features in western United States and minor features in Alaska.

Features which are prominent in the public mind by reason of accessibility, outstanding natural beauty, or other special attribute should be placed in the category next higher than their magnitude alone would warrant.

Features in areas where many features are unnamed should be considered in the category next lower than their magnitude alone would warrant.

An existing name should not be replaced unless it is a duplicate or is inappropriate.

Names of men who qualify for features of one order of magnitude may be applied to features of a lower order if such application is particularly appropriate.

I. MAJOR FEATURES

With the following qualifications, the Board will consider applying the name of a deceased person to a natural feature of the first order of magnitude, such as a mountain

range or group; a high, massive, or spectacular mountain, summit, peak, or ridge; a large river; a major island; or a prominent cape:

1. Only one major feature of a kind should be named for a particular individual, and few features of first order of magnitude of different kinds should be named for any individual.

2. Only one whose public service, achievements, and fame are likely to be enduring should have his name applied to a feature of first order of magnitude.

3. A feature of first order of magnitude, except in an area where few features are named, should be named only for a person whose public service and achievements are likely to be more than regional in effect, though his work and reputation may be only regional in scope.

4. In applying the name of an individual to any feature, and particularly to a first-order feature, a clear distinction should be made between honorable fame and mere notoriety.

5. The importance of the public service or achievements of the person whose name is proposed should be commensurate with the magnitude or grandeur of the feature.

6. In areas where few features are named, a major feature may be named for a person associated with it or with the region in one or more of the following ways:

(a) Through exploration, survey, or scientific investigation resulting in contributions to the knowledge of the feature in question or of the region that encompasses it.

(b) Through personal efforts resulting in conservation of the natural heritage of the place or region or in its long-range development.

(c) Through long association with the feature, such as residence or work in the locality.

(d) Through outstanding public service to the residents and the region.

II. SECONDARY FEATURES

With the following qualifications, the Board will consider applying the name of a deceased person to a natural feature of the second-order of magnitude, such as a mountain other than that of the greatest size, a ridge, a small glacier, a valley, a medium-to-small island, a medium-sized river:

1. The person whose name is proposed should have been associated with the feature or region in one or more of the following ways:

(a) Through exploration, survey, or scientific investigation resulting in contributions to the knowledge of the feature in question or of the region that encompasses it.

(b) Through personal efforts resulting in conservation of the natural heritage of the place or region or in its long-range development.

(c) Through long association with the feature, such as residence or work in the locality.

(d) Through outstanding public service to the residents and the region.

2. The name of a deceased member of the Armed Forces will be considered for application to a feature on or near which he met death in line of duty or engaged in heroic action. The name of a member of the Armed Forces who died in line of duty anywhere will be considered for application to an unnamed feature with which he was associated.

III. MINOR FEATURES

With the following qualifications, the Board will consider applying the name of a person, living or deceased, to a relatively small natural feature, such as a hill, watercourse, or cove:

1. If the name is well established in local usage.

2. Name of an early occupant or owner.

3. The name of a member of the Armed Forces who died in line of duty anywhere

will be considered for application to a feature with which he was associated.

4. The name of a person who died on or near the feature.

MARCH 5, 1946.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5512) to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive.
Page 2, line 13, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this legislation approved by the minority members of the committee?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think it has been. I will withdraw the request if the gentleman wishes. I will tell the gentleman what the Senate amendments do. Originally the funds available to pay for this were to be available from the Hill-Burton Act. The Senate amendments struck that provision out.

I asked the author of the bill to communicate with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] about it.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] agreeable to it?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not heard whether he was contacted or not.

Mr. MARTIN. I think probably the gentleman should withhold action on the amendments until the gentleman from Michigan can be consulted.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

STATE DEFENSE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 61 of the National Defense Act, as amended (39 Stat. 198), is amended by adding the following subsections:

"(b) In addition to the Army National Guard and Air National Guard heretofore authorized by this act, the States may, as provided by the laws of such State, organize and maintain State defense forces in conformance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. The regulations of the Secretary of the Army shall, among other things, provide for the maximum composition of the State defense forces within each State and shall limit the organization of such forces, during periods of peace, to a strength as deemed appropriate for organizing and planning and to serve as a basis for the rapid expansion of such State de-

fense forces, if and when any part of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard may be ordered to active duty in the service of the United States, or during periods of a national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President. State defense forces established under this section may not be called, ordered, or in any manner drafted, as such, into the Armed Forces of the United States. State defense forces may be used within their respective State borders as deemed necessary by the chief executive thereof. A member of a State defense force established under this section is not exempt from military service in the Armed Forces of the United States under any Federal law by reason of membership therein, and further, such member is not entitled to pay, allowances, subsistence, transportation, or medical care or treatment from Federal funds. No person may become a member of the organized militia established under this section if he is a member of the Reserve Forces as defined in section 101 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

"(c) The President may prescribe for the issuance of such arms, ammunition, clothing, and other items of military equipment for the use of the State defense forces as he deems appropriate.

"(d) The National Guard Bureau shall be charged with administering the provisions of this section pursuant to policies prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Army and the several States.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State' means any State, Commonwealth, Territory, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, or Guam."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and previously entered special orders.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and previously entered special orders.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS ACT OF 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 314, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. No amendments shall be in order to section 4 of the bill except amendments offered by direction

of the Committee on Public Works, which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but shall not be subject to amendment, and except it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 7494 and all points of order against such substitute are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H. R. 7474 the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, how long has this rule been out and may I ask whether under our rules it can be considered at this time?

The SPEAKER. It can be because it was reported on yesterday.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will make in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act. This rule is a modified open rule. All of the sections of the bill, H. R. 7474, are open to amendment in the usual fashion except section 4 which deals with the tax provisions.

In addition to that, the so-called Dondero bill, H. R. 7494, which, as I understand it, includes the Clay report recommendation for a bond method of financing will be in order as a substitute for the whole bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the rule, supported by the committee, that it will not be in order for an amendment to be proposed as a substitute proposal in the nature of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] and as outlined before the Rules Committee yesterday by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. BOLLING. We were informally advised that such a bill would be in order as an amendment or as a substitute for the Dondero substitute. Since it does not contain provisions with regard to taxation, we were informed that that particular piece of legislation would appear to be in order as an amendment to the Dondero bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In other words, if this rule is adopted, the House will be given an opportunity to vote upon the so-called Thompson bill, the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] or the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BOLLING. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I take this time because there is only an hour on the rule. I do not think that is sufficient time to go into this matter. There are also 3 hours general debate and the 3 hours general debate as provided in the rule is not going to give every Member an opportunity to be heard. I would like to have at least 30 minutes to speak on the bill. It is the most far-reaching bill this Congress has ever passed. It is a tax bill—one of the largest tax bills ever passed. It is an appropriation bill—appropriating more money than the House has ever appropriated in any bill. I venture to say there will not be 25 percent of the Members have a chance to speak on the bill. I would be inclined to vote against the rule unless I can be assured that every Member will be given an opportunity to speak on this far-reaching piece of legislation. Now, the gentleman said this was a semi-open rule. He should have said "semi-open gag rule" because, if there was ever a time when the American taxpayers were gagged, it is in this rule. The tax plan cannot be remedied and you are ramming it down the throats of all of the farmers and the truck drivers and a lot of business enterprises. They will be gagged to death—clear out of existence. This is about the worst piece of legislation I have ever seen come before the House.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is aware that there are 19 sections to the bill, and only 1, section 4, is closed to amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That is the tax section.

Mr. BOLLING. Therefore, under the 5-minute rule, every Member will have adequate opportunity to express himself in the usual fashion.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. For 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But the tax feature in this bill is closed to any amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. Except to the amendment which is contained in the bill H. R. 7494, made in order by the rule, which is commonly called the Dondero bill, and contains the Clay report proposal for a bonding program to finance the legislation.

Mr. GROSS. But individual Members of the House will not have an opportunity to offer amendments to the taxing features of this bill.

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct, with the qualifications I have stated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In addition, the Committee on Public Works can offer amendments.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Public Works is also authorized to offer amendments.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's present highway systems, Federal and State, are inadequate to do the job they are called upon to undertake every 24 hours of the day.

Almost every element of our economic expansion—which has brought us, under this administration, the greatest prosperity in our history—has kept pace with our growing Nation. We have lagged in the nationwide development of our most necessary roadways.

That is the reason why we must have a bold, aggressive program to get the highway-building job done—a job that is most necessary for the growth and the security of the United States.

We must remember that America is in a period of massive population growth. For this reason, our road-building plans should be laid out on the basis of at least the next decade if we are to accomplish what is needed to keep our highways in pace with our economic development.

President Eisenhower has developed a 10-year accelerated highway-building plan which will be wholly adequate for the growth and for the defense needs of our Nation for many years after its completion.

The President's highway program provides for the completion of broad avenues of exit from cities and for high-speed highways throughout the land.

The President's plan proposes that the Federal Government expend \$3,122,500,000 a year—or a total of \$31,255,000,000 in 10 years. The biggest share of the Federal Government's expenditure—\$25 billion—would go to improve and expand interstate highways over the 10-year period. The various States and municipalities will be asked to contribute a total of \$1,166,660,000 during the 10-year period, bringing to nearly \$27 billion total expenditures for the interstate system.

Under the President's plan, States would not be called upon to siphon off vast matching funds to meet Federal requirements, but would instead be able to continue improvements with their own funds of highways not eligible for Federal aid.

The President's program, realistically taking into account the rapid population growth and economic expansion now underway, directs its emphasis squarely at the place where the people's needs are greatest. This program provides \$6,225,000,000 in Federal aid for primary, secondary, and urban road construction over a 10-year period, broken down as follows: Primary roads, \$3,150,000,000; secondary roads, \$2,100,000,000; urban roads, \$750 million, with \$225 million going for forest highways.

Detailed studies of roadbuilding needs indicate that this is the amount needed and the amount that can be economically spent on roadbuilding over a 10-year period.

The President's plan will not raise taxes; it will not increase the Federal debt.

The President's plan will, across the Nation, bring relief in the form of better roads to those of us who are paying more than we should be to travel on today's

narrow, jammed, and dangerous highways.

In seeking to establish a Federal Highway Corporation to finance the 10-year, \$31,225,000,000 highway program, the President has taken into account the support of his program from many sources. These include the majority of the Nation's governors and mayors. These are the men who must accept the final responsibility for meeting the people's needs.

The Federal Highway Corporation would sell 30-year bonds to raise more than \$21 billion. Additional revenue for highway building would come from regular sources, without increasing taxes.

Bond issues for highway construction are as old as the Nation's highway system itself.

By using this system of finance, by 1956 the Nation would have a 40,000-mile, 4-lane network of roads, linking all major industrial and urban areas and providing 90 percent of all cities of 50,000 population and over, including 42 State capitals, with modern, safe, and efficient roads—roads adequate to meet emergency needs and adequate for the anticipated growth across the Nation.

No other road program before us will do so.

Overall, the 10-year program for providing the necessary road network will cost \$101 billion in 10 years. The plan calls for Federal aid totaling 30 percent of this total in the 10-year period.

State and local governments, to meet the needs, are expected to increase their expenditures on Federal-aid primary and secondary road systems to finance the remaining 70 percent.

I ask this Congress to approve the President's program, in keeping with what, in my opinion, are the wishes of the majority of the State and local governments in the Nation.

As a Member of this body, I am fully aware that we are in substantial agreement that we must undertake without delay a major roadbuilding task across the Nation.

The appalling accident and death rates will be reduced on a new highway system and economic waste will fall. These are immediate benefits of the program.

What we must do if we are to meet the issue intelligently is build up a modern network of highways in the next decade, not a piecemeal construction program in a shorter period. Not a lagging, dollar-consuming program that will, prayerfully, do the job sometime in the far-distant future.

Some critics question the need of spending \$11 billion in interest on 30-year highway bonds.

Let me answer that in this way:

Each day every car owner in the Nation wastes money on inadequate roads.

Every time a driver makes an unnecessary stop in his car because of bad or crowded roads, it costs him or her a cent and one-half in tire, brake, and battery wear.

Each year, the waste in gasoline and oil on old-fashioned, crowded roads and highways costs individual motorists a total of \$43.32; unnecessary tire wear costs each of us a total of \$11 a year;

unnecessary wear and tear on brakes cost \$6.25.

Within the next decade, when the President's highway program will be needed most, an estimated 81 million vehicles will be traveling a total of 814 billion miles each year—an increase of 46 percent over the total number of drivers and miles traveled today. This road program will save money to the auto drivers.

The need is now. Our farmers are bringing their produce to market on rutted and soft-surfaced roads in many areas, paying dearly in wear and tear on their trucks in doing so. We need new highways for our children—to see that they get to school and back home safely. We need new highways for our housewives—for their weekly shopping, to keep the home going. We need new highways for our industrial development. And our military leaders emphasize the desperate need for a modern highway system. We in Congress have a responsibility to the people of our great country. They are a patient people, they are a responsible people, and they are a grateful people. I can think of no other service that could abound with benefits for so many as this 10-year program to bring up to date the American road system.

We have a man of high vision in the White House. After careful study, he has proposed a 10-year highway plan that will meet all of our needs in the foreseeable future. It is geared to the entire administration program of peace and prosperity. It treats all Americans as partners in the necessary venture of building up a modern system of travel to match the Nation's industrial and population growth.

The best Nation in the world surely should have the best highway system in the world.

The President's program will provide for such a great need and will keep our highways in pace with our general economic progress and our prosperity. Let us substitute his bill for that reported by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman is supporting this semiclosed rule that prohibits any amendments whatever on the tax provisions of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. The only way we can get legislation on the floor is through a rule, and that rule having been reported, yes, I shall support it.

Mr. GROSS. A rule excluding any amendments to one of the most important features of this bill, which is the taxing feature? What is complex about taxes with respect to motor vehicles and fuels?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is not going to get into a debate with me on taxes in this short space of time. I do not have sufficient time to do that. But the only way we can secure a road bill is to adopt the rule putting the legislation in order.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts said that the President's road program contemplated the spending of \$101 billion over a 10-year period for this highway program, and I think he also said that could be accomplished without raising taxes or without increasing the national debt. Now I submit that I need a little explanation on that, and I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts would explain that statement so that even a Congressman would understand it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I have an explanation of that question, and I expect to have time given to me to answer it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will listen to it with great interest.

Mr. MARTIN. I believe the gentleman from Missouri is an intelligent Member of the House, and when the facts are presented to him, he will appreciate how it can be done. I must ask him to remember that we are a growing country and we are constantly increasing our resources. As they develop, we can pay this bill without hurting anyone, and we hope some day in the not too distant future that the tension in the world will be removed, and then we can pay these bills so rapidly that you would not know that we had done it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My question is this, assuming that the Dondero substitute is not adopted—just assuming that.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not like to assume that. I am hoping, John, that you will give me enough votes to pass it.

Mr. McCORMACK. But assuming that it is not.

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot assume that, but you can.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, they ask these questions in a courtroom on the basis of an assumption.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not a lawyer. I am just a plain newspaperman who tells the truth always, and not on the basis of assumptions.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the situation develops where the final vote is between the bill reported out of the committee and a straight authorization, that is with the Dondero substitute not adopted, would the gentleman then favor the committee bill?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman would have to go into his office and prayerfully give consideration to any such unexpected alternative.

Mr. GREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GREGOR. I just want to add my word with reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Missouri relative to the \$101 billion highway program. There has never been presented to this Congress a program calling for \$101 billion. As the result of a survey made, which would be the utopia of all engineers, including all roads, even the

farm-to-market roads, the primary roads, and the interstate roads and all the intrastate road systems, if they were built to the plans and specifications described by certain engineers the overall cost including the share of the Federal Government and the States and the local governments might possibly be \$101 billion. But we have never had presented to this Congress for any consideration a \$101 billion road program.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not to go into an explanation of the bill, but I first would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] for his explanation of the Clay report. It is a synopsis of what we heard for the past 7 or 8 weeks when we were holding hearings on that particular subject. I would like to inform the House why and how the bill that we are considering is here today, and how it comes to be here. While we were considering hearings on the Clay report, the other body took action on it. The other body, because of the huge interest cost of \$11,500,000,000 and the mortgage on the highways of America for 30 years, voted down the Clay report 2 to 1; I think the vote was 60 to 31. We were told at the time that if we brought a bill in here, a straight authorization bill to do the same job that would raise the public debt limit the President would not sign it. So we were faced with only one alternative, and that was the unpopular task of trying to get a highway bill which will do the job after the study of the bill by Public Roads, the State highway commissioners, and the study that the Clay Commission made and reported to the President. So we took the unpopular course of bringing a bill in here that will finance this program and build it in a period of 12 years and pay for it in a period of 15 years. That is the reason this bill is here today.

It would have been an easy task for this committee to bring in an authorization bill that the President would not sign, but we would only be wasting the time of the committee and the time of the House. Also, it is foolish even to bring in a bill with the bond features in it, outside of the public debt, because the other body has already served notice on us that they would not pass such a bill at this session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the bond issue what will be the ultimate additional cost that the American people would have to pay?

Mr. FALLON. It was reported in the other body, and it was testified to before our committee that it would cost an additional \$11,500,000,000 that would be paid out in interest and other charges.

Mr. McCORMACK. One further question: Is it fair to assume that even if the committee bill passes, which is a 12-year program, that there would have to be additional programs? Because the 40,000-mile interstate mileage is not go-

ing to complete the future necessities and demands of our country. Is that true?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we pass a bill providing for a bond issue, bonds would be issued for probably up to 30 years, so we would be giving a first mortgage on our highways for 30 years. Is that right?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us say that 10 or 12 years from now it becomes necessary to extend the program, pass another bill and authorize another bond issue; that would be a second mortgage at that time. It would be rather difficult to raise a second mortgage under those circumstances, would it not?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. This bill is a pay-as-you-go bill.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct, and all the money that is authorized to be spent on the highways in the next 15 years will be available for 15 years further if the necessity arises.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Apropos the questions of the gentleman from Massachusetts, is it not also true that if the Dondero substitute should prevail providing for the issuance of bonds then, if the Congress of the United States levy additional taxes specifically to reduce those bonds, to that same extent you would reduce the life of the bonds, and interest payments would be reduced?

Mr. FALLON. That is absolutely true.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are three bills that will probably be considered if this rule is adopted, and a number of others have been introduced.

I do not think any of these bills ought to pass at this time. Everybody is in a hurry to adjourn and we have this adjournment rush on for this weekend, but whether it is this weekend or next weekend, this House is not going to give to this complicated matter the serious determination that a matter of this magnitude needs.

I do not care which one of these bills you pass, you are going to be buying a pig in a poke for \$48 billion. Somebody is going to pay for it.

The Democratic bill undertakes to fix the pay-as-you-go plan; and, of course, the tax is placed upon probably the most unpopular users of the highways. The Republican bill has by some arithmetical legerdemain managed to fix it up so that nobody is going to pay anything. There is not going to be any additional bond issue, there is not going to be any additional tax. If that can be done I am for it, so are the rest of you, but I doubt whether that can be accomplished. It all illustrates that we are in a state of confusion about this bill.

There are four separate minority reports on the committee bill and we are just not in a position to consider it at this time.

Let me tell you something about this closed rule. The Rules Committee gave to the Committee on Public Works the right to write a bill on a tax matter and

present it to you without any right of amendment. When I asked the chairman of that committee whether his committee had asked for a closed rule, I was told that the committee had voted on the question of a closed rule and the committee itself voted 17 to 11 against asking the Committee on Rules for a closed rule. In addition to that, I was told that the Committee on Public Works had voted, probably by a similar majority, against asking for an open rule. We never were able to find out what the committee itself wanted in the nature of a rule and the committee itself now does not know what it wants in the nature of a rule because there are four minority reports.

Here we are in the last 5 days of the session being asked to deal with this tremendous proposition. What are you thinking about? This should not be considered at this time and none of these bills ought to be passed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman knows of my high regard for him and he knows also that I know, and agree with him, that we ought to proceed carefully with measures of this sort. But I would like to call to his attention the fact that a commission was appointed, the Clay Commission, that studied this matter for months and months. The Committee on Public Works held hearings for weeks and weeks. There were deliberations within the committee. And then after weeks and weeks of deliberations the committee reported a bill. The rule, I think properly, makes in order a substitute so that the House can work its will as between a tax bill and a bond issue bill. Personally, I think we are probably as well informed about the matter as we will ever be and that now is the time to proceed to act on the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to answer the gentleman's question if I knew what it was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand the gentleman from Indiana, he says the Clay Commission knows all about this, so it is not necessary that we know anything about it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, that seems to be the way things are working out.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia had a good point when he brought out and emphasized the fact that there is much confusion in connection with this bill. It is true there was much time spent on the Clay report. There was considerable time spent in hearings by the committee on that phase of the matter. But in all of my experience in the Congress I have never seen the taxpayer divested of his cash so rapidly as the Public Works Com-

mittee did in the 12 hours of hearings on the tax provision of this bill. In 12 hours they were able to come up with a scheme which will relieve the American taxpayers of \$12 billion. I do not think we can improve on a billion dollars an hour.

When we say that certain segments of our economy are going to pay this tax, we are just kidding the American taxpayer. Whenever you put a tax on a basic transportation item such as you are doing in this bill, you are doing nothing more than placing indirectly a hidden manufacturer's sales tax on the American people. When we vote the issue here today will be whether you and I want to vote for a discriminatory tax under a closed rule where the discriminatory feature cannot be removed or you want to vote for a bill that has been proposed by the President of the United States and has been given thorough consideration.

I hope that the Dondero substitute will be agreed to. Time and much consideration has been given that bill. I am not going to be critical of the closed rule. Ever since I have been here we have out of necessity had to consider tax measures under a closed rule. But I am critical of a precedent being broken and a committee other than the Committee on Ways and Means being assigned what is primarily a tax bill. What we have is a discriminatory tax bill which incidentally gets highways.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the time allotted by this rule is wholly inadequate for even fair consideration of this bill. I guess that in general debate it will amount to spending about fifteen or sixteen billion dollars per hour of study by this committee.

Now, this bill will project a tax program and a spending program many years into the future. It had, as the gentleman who preceded me mentioned, 12 hours of study in the Committee on Public Works. And, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules said, "Just look at the different views that the committee had on this bill." Here are the minority views. Turn to the front page of your report and read it for yourselves: Additional minority views, separate views, individual views. It is what you might call a political quickie, and little good and much harm is sure to come from this bill if it is enacted.

Now, as to the rule: They call it a limited open rule. Well, it depends on who the man is who is sponsoring the rule. It is so gassy that few of you are going to have an opportunity to be heard on this bill, but every one of you is going to be given an opportunity to be heard when you go back to your districts, when the farmers start talking to you about this tax when they start collecting it. There will be a 3-cent tax put on their fuel, and they will get a refund of 1 cent, and when they buy that 50 gallons of gasoline and they get that 1 cent for the use of the machinery on the farm, they will say, "Why do we not get the other 2 cents?" If they are entitled to a 1-cent

reduction, they are entitled to 3. They ought to have it, and they will want to know why they cannot get it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Your diesel-fuel people have had that exemption on off-the-highway use, have they not?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I will go into that later, but I will not take the time on this rule to explain that. But it is so gassy that a lot of you folks will be anxious to get away from the mess and come back to the District next year when the Congress reconvenes and reconsider it.

I want to correct a misimpression that was left here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. The gentleman from Illinois said, "Is it not true that this rule is open enough so that the members of the Committee on Public Works can offer amendments?" And the gentleman from Missouri said, "Yes." Well, that is not true. Read the rule. The members of the committee have no opportunity to offer amendments. The only way they can do that is to go into executive session and call this thing back. Here is the language in the rule: No amendment shall be in order to section 4 of this bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works. Now, that is not the individual members. The members of the Committee on Public Works have no opportunity to offer amendments to this bill; it is only an amendment offered by direction of the committee, not the members. I want that impression cleared up, because it has been called to my attention that any member of the Committee on Public Works could offer an amendment. He cannot do it.

Again I want to remind you of the vote in this committee. A motion was made to direct the chairman of the Committee on Public Works to go to the Committee on Rules and ask for this gag rule. That motion was voted down 17 to 11. Now, that is how the committee stood on it. They were opposed to this gag rule themselves. And, of course, when they asked for instructions in regard to an open rule, they also voted that down. So, that further adds to the confusion. It shows that they did not know what kind of a rule they wanted, because they did not know what kind of a bill they had to offer.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the rule that has been presented to the House today makes it impossible for me to offer an amendment which I had intended to offer to the bill, to provide for an exemption of all nonhighway users from payment of the gasoline tax. The committee recognized the fact that it is improper and inequitable to tax nonhighway users for gasoline, when this fuel tax is dedicated to a road program, when it exempted nonhighway users from the tax increase.

WHAT IS FAIR?

If it is equitable to exempt 1 cent of the tax, it is certainly fair and just that the entire 3-cent tax also be exempted. The rule that has been presented for the handling of this bill today makes it impossible for this House to express any voice in that matter. I think we are passing up a great opportunity here to enact legislation under a fair system that will be fair to farmers and fishermen and anybody else who uses gasoline in a non-highway use.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. I should like to commend the gentleman on his statement, that this rule makes it impossible to offer his amendment. I agree with him completely on the justice of his proposed amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. This is going to make it inevitable that we act upon this proposal at some later date. Nonhighway users in the country are not going to allow such an iniquitous situation or condition in our tax laws.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. I want to concur in what the gentleman is saying. I think it is unfair to tax people for highway use when they do not use the highway. When this law was enacted, farm equipment was not mechanized. Mostly horses were used. It is not fair that these people should pay a road tax when they are not using the highways.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. Certainly it is not fair to charge a farmer 2 cents of tax and exempt him on the 1 cent.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman on his efforts and let him know that I heartily agree with him. Is the gentleman advocating that we vote down the rule?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is making it very clear that he does not think the rule is fair.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I expect to talk solely on the tax features of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the automobile and truck owners of America are now paying more than their fair share of the taxes. In 1953 the Federal Government collected on gasoline, lubricating oil, tires, and tubes \$1,144,000,000 in excise taxes. On automobiles, trucks, buses, trailers, and auto parts and accessories, the Federal Government collected another \$1 billion in excise taxes. In 1953 the Federal Government gave back to the States in grants-in-aid for roads \$515,444,540, retaining approximately \$1,750,000,000. This means the Federal Government kept \$3 out of every \$4 collected in spe-

cial taxes from autos and truck owners, turned \$1 back to the States for building of roads, and spent \$3 for general Government needs.

The auto and truck owners of America are being gypped because they pay all the other taxes for Government that other citizens pay and in addition these special taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if the one and three-quarter billion dollars now collected from the automobile and truck owners of America in special taxes now being used for general Government expenditures were earmarked for this road program, it would pay the entire cost of the bond program of the President's plan plus the interest, without the need of any new taxes.

I am therefore against any new taxes for this road-building program, because I am convinced that the taxes now being collected will pay and should pay for the bond program and the interest thereon.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that a measure of this importance should come before the House at a time when we have ample time for debate and real opportunity has been given to the proper committee, the gentleman's Committee on Ways and Means, to do something on the tax measure? This is really a tax measure as well as a highway bill.

Mr. MASON. Of course, that is the only sensible course.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the only sensible thing to do here is to vote down the rule and in that way have the opportunity to amend the bill so as to improve it.

Mr. MASON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that the Committee on Ways and Means by a formal vote delegated the tax power exercised in this bill to the Committee on Public Works?

Mr. MASON. It is true that they did by a formal vote of 15 to 10. That speaks for itself.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. How did the gentleman vote?

Mr. MASON. Of course, the gentleman knows how I voted without asking that.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unthinkable that a measure of the ramifications of this bill should come before the House of Representatives under any part of a gag rule. I do not care what committee of the Congress delegated to another committee authority with respect to taxes. I have to vote

here today on my own responsibility as other Members do. I simply want to say that this rule ought to be defeated. If someone does not put on a quorum call when we finish debate on the rule, you can be sure you are going to vote on the record to knock out this gag rule. It is unbelievable that Members of the House are denied the opportunity to offer amendments to the important tax section. Defeat of this rule will mean, and very properly so, that the House will have an opportunity to work its will.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 129, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—274

Adair	Coon	Hayworth
Addonizio	Cooper	Hébert
Albert	Corbett	Henderson
Alger	Coudert	Herlong
Allen, Calif.	Cramer	Heslerton
Allen, Ill.	Cretella	Hess
Andresen,	Cunningham	Hiestand
August H.	Curtis, Mass.	Hill
Andrews	Curtis, Mo.	Hoeven
Arends	Dague	Hoffman, Ill.
Aspinall	Davidson	Holfield
Auchincloss	Davis, Tenn.	Holmes
Avery	Davis, Wis.	Holt
Ayres	Deane	Holtzman
Bailey	Delaney	Hope
Baker	Dempsey	Horan
Baldwin	Denton	Hosmer
Bass, N. H.	Derounian	Huddleston
Bates	Devereux	Hull
Baumbart	Diggs	Hyde
Beamer	Dixon	Ikard
Becker	Dodd	James
Belcher	Dollinger	Johansen
Bennett, Fla.	Dolliver	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Dondero	Johnson, Wis.
Betts	Dorn, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.
Boggs	Doyle	Judd
Boland	Ellsworth	Karsten
Bolling	Evins	Kean
Bolton,	Fallon	Kearns
Frances P.	Fascell	Keating
Bolton,	Feighan	Kee
Oliver P.	Fenton	Kelley, Pa.
Bosch	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Bowler	Flood	Keogh
Boyle	Forand	Kilday
Bray	Ford	King, Calif.
Brooks, La.	Frazier	Kirwan
Brooks, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Klein
Brown, Ohio	Friedel	Kluczynski
Brownson	Fulton	Knox
Broyhill	Garmatz	Knutson
Buckley	Gavin	Laird
Budge	Gentry	Lane
Burnside	George	Latham
Bush	Gordon	Lesinski
Byrnes, Wis.	Grant	Lipscomb
Canfield	Gregory	Lovre
Carnahan	Griffiths	McConnell
Carrigg	Gubser	McCormack
Cederberg	Hagen	McCulloch
Celler	Hale	McDonough
Chase	Halleck	McGregor
Chelf	Hand	McIntire
Chenoweth	Harden	McVey
Christopher	Harrison, Nebr.	Macdonald
Clark	Harrison, Va.	Machrowicz
Clevenger	Harvey	Mack, Wash.
Cole	Hays, Ohio	Madden

Magnuson
Mailliard
Martin
Meador
Morrow
Metcalfe
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Pfost
Polk
Powell
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Ray

Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Riehlman
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Sheehan
Sheppard
Short
Sleminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Sullivan
Talle
Teague, Calif.

Thomas
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Velde
Vorys
Wainwright
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widman
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—129

Abbott
Abernethy
Alexander
Andersen,
H. Carl
Ashley
Ashmore
Barden
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bell
Bentley
Berry
Blitch
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ga.
Burdick
Burleson
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carlyle
Chatham
Chudoff
Church
Colmer
Cooley
Crumpacker
Davis, Ga.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Dies
Donohue
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Fernandez
Fino
Fisher
Fjare

Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Gary
Gathings
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gwinn
Haley
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Kilgore
King, Pa.
Landrum
Lanham
Lankford
LeCompte
Long
McCarthy
McMillan
Mack, Ill.
Mahon
Marshall
Mason
Matthews
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nelson
Norrell
O'Brien, N. Y.

O'Konski
Osmer
Passman
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Preston
Quigley
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Tex.
Sadlak
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shuford
Slisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Steed
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tuck
Van Zandt
Vinson
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Blatnik

NOT VOTING—30

Anfuso
Boykin
Buchanan
Chipperfield
Dingell
Donovan
Eberharter
Gamble
Gray
Green, Pa.

Hardy
Hillings
Hinshaw
Kearney
Kilburn
Krueger
McDowell
Miller, N. Y.
Mumma
Perkins

Radwan
Rains
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rhodes, Oreg.
Shelley
Vursell
Watts
Wilson, Calif.
Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Donovan for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Kilburn.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Chipperfield.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL. Were he present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FOGARTY, and Mr. PHILBIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6382) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. RICHARDS, ZABLOCKI, DODD, VORYS, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS ACT OF 1955

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7474, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the year 1954 saw the recognition by many people of the existing deficiencies in our highway system and the necessity for doing something about it at an early date. Committees were appointed by the governor's con-

ference and by the President of the United States to give attention to this problem. The activities of these groups culminated in a report to the President by his Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, in January of this year. The report of the Advisory Committee pointed to the inadequacy of our present system of highways to accommodate the approximately 58 million motor vehicles now registered to operate over them and the urgent necessity to deal with the national traffic jam immediately in view of the prospect of vehicle registrations reaching 81 million by 1965. The report attributed these conditions to two basic causes: First, the 4-year moratorium imposed upon construction during World War II, which prevented both adequate maintenance and replacement; and, second, the shrinkage in the purchasing power of the road dollar. While dollarwise our expenditures on roads have increased materially since construction activities began after World War II, the level of physical construction is now but little higher than it was prewar. The resulting failure of our highway program to keep pace with needs has contributed to the high level of casualties from traffic accidents, which is truly alarming. Accidents on our highways take approximately 100 lives every day and the daily rate of injury is approximately 3,000. No monetary value can be placed on this appalling loss, nor must any be placed upon it for the people of this country to want to take drastic remedial action. The monetary cost attributable to highway accidents was placed in the Clay committee report at approximately \$4½ billion annually. Improved highways will of course not eliminate these costs, but studies do demonstrate that both the accident rate and the fatality rate are sharply reduced on roads built to the standards intended to be used on the interstate system which it is our purpose to build at a greatly accelerated pace as a means of meeting the serious problem we are confronted with.

Bills were introduced in the Senate and House implementing the program outlined in the report to the President by his Highway Advisory Committee. The bill in the House was referred to the Committee on Public Works and came before the Roads Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. The Senate acted first on the highway program and passed a bill, S. 1048, which also was before the Roads Subcommittee. Extensive hearings were held on these bills, as a result of which the committee reached certain conclusions and arrived at certain decisions. There was little dissent from the view that our present system of highways was inadequate to meet the anticipated needs of commerce, the national and civil defense, and the desires of the public generally for an abundance of high quality roads. However, some divergence of views appeared on such questions as the role to be played by the Federal Government in relation to the governments of the several States; the type of network most needed; the length of the program required; and, of foremost importance, how the program was to be financed.

H. R. 4260, designed to carry out the plan of the President's Advisory Committee, placed special emphasis on the National System of Interstate Highways and authorized the expenditure of \$25 billion of Federal funds over a period of 10 years, nearly all to be financed by bonds to be issued by a Federal Highway Corporation created by Congress for this purpose, with the bonds to be outside the Federal budget and not included in the national debt subject to the statutory debt limit. The total cost of the interstate system was estimated at \$27 billion, with the State and local governments providing the balance of \$2 billion. It was contemplated that the Federal contributions to the primary, secondary, and urban systems be continued at a level less than the \$700 million annually, provided by the Federal Highway Act of 1954, specifically \$600 million for these three categories. The bill passed by the Senate contained authorizations for appropriations for a 5-year period through the fiscal year 1961, amounting to \$7¼ billion in total for the interstate system and \$900 million annually for the regular Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems. No financing provisions were included. Constitutionally, of course, no tax provisions could be incorporated in the Senate bill, and the bond-financing proposal was rejected as basically unsound.

At the conclusion of extensive hearings before the Roads Subcommittee, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7072, incorporating a somewhat different approach to the solution of the highway problem. Upon consideration in executive session, a special subcommittee consisting of 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans was appointed to consider H. R. 7072, S. 1048, the bill that passed the Senate, and H. R. 4260, the bill carrying out the views of the President's Advisory Committee on a national-highway program, now superseded by H. R. 7494. They concluded that H. R. 7072 came closer to meeting the views of the committee than the other bills and recommended that consideration be given to that bill with certain amendments. These amendments were incorporated in a committee print, and because it contained a section imposing taxes to finance the program in part, 2 days of hearings were held on this feature before the full Public Works Committee. Everyone desiring to be heard was given an opportunity and practically all parties that had shown an interest in the subject did appear and make a presentation on the subject. The Ways and Means Committee cooperated by designating five of its members to sit with the Public Works Committee to hear the testimony on the tax provisions.

Numerous amendments to the committee print were agreed to involving a compromise of many viewpoints, chiefly in connection with the tax provisions, and a clean bill, H. R. 7474, was introduced. That bill was reported favorably by a vote of 17 to 9 and is the bill now before you. Minority views were submitted by four members of the committee. Additional minority views were submitted by 2 of the signators of the minority views and 3 other members of the committee. Separate views were sub-

mitted by 2 of the signators of the additional minority views, and individual views were submitted by 1 of the members of the committee. This rather complicated lineup is a reflection of the complexity of the problem, and as I explain the bill briefly, section by section, I shall attempt to bring to your attention as fairly as I can, the nature of the differences of views in the committee. At the outset, however, I should like to give you a broad outline of the bill and draw to your attention the major differences between this bill, the Senate bill, H. R. 7494, and the present law.

The overall objective of H. R. 7474 is to provide a blueprint as well as the means for accomplishing a long-range highway program with due emphasis on our most immediate need, namely, the interstate system, but with due regard for the remainder of our highways, namely, the regular Federal aid primary and secondary systems and the urban extensions thereof. H. R. 7474 authorizes the appropriation of \$24 billion over a 13-year period beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for the construction and improvement of the interstate system. In this respect the bill closely resembles H. R. 7494 with its proposal for a Federal expenditure of \$25 billion over 10 years, and differs materially from the Senate bill which only authorizes \$7¼ billion over 5 years. The Senate bill thus provides only an initial program constituting about one-third of the total program. Our committee is strongly of the view that it is preferable to make provision for the entire program at this time in order that the benefits of long-range planning may be derived. In this respect all of the bills reflect a change in the policy of the present law which authorizes appropriations for only two years.

As to the regular Federal aid program, H. R. 7474 authorizes the appropriation of \$725 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and declares it to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the sums for these purposes by \$25 million each year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. This constitutes an average of about \$875 million per year and by 1969 the annual total would be \$1,025,000,000. In this respect our bill more closely resembles the Senate bill which authorizes \$900 million annually for the next 5 years. H. R. 4260, on the other hand, contemplates a freezing of Federal contributions for the regular Federal aid programs at \$600 million a year for an indefinite period, possibly 30 years. With respect to this important item we believe our bill to be infinitely better than H. R. 7494, which ignores the needs of these important segments of our highway system. It should not be overlooked that these systems, which carry approximately 85 percent of the total traffic, probably mean more to the farmers and to the enjoyment of motoring by the private automobile owner than does the interstate system. As compared with the Senate bill, again we think our bill better because it permits longer range planning.

In one way or another, all of the programs reflected by the three bills I have

been discussing contemplate a continuation at current levels of the Federal contribution for roads in the Federal domain.

The matching ratio for regular Federal aid is to be continued on a 50-50 basis under all of the proposals. On the interstate system, as a recognition of the predominating national interest, the matching ratio has been changed from the present 60-40 Federal to State ratio to a 90-10 Federal to State ratio under H. R. 7474 and the Senate bill. In H. R. 4260 no specific matching funds by the States are specified, but it is stated in the President's Advisory Committee report that the traditional requirement for local financial participation is sound and that the States would be expected to contribute annually the amount they are required to contribute under the 1954 act to obtain funds from the \$175 million made available to the interstate system by the Federal Government 1954, and that the cities would be expected to participate to the same degree.

So much for the general outline of the program. Hand in hand with the consideration of the program itself went the consideration of how to finance it. This was a responsibility that the committee recognized and was willing to face squarely. There were some who felt that it would be sufficient for our committee to decide what was needed in the way of roads to meet our needs and to let someone else worry about where and how the Federal Treasury would meet the bill. However, in view of the general recognition of the unbalanced state of our Federal budget and the already burdensome level of our national debt, it was felt by the majority of our committee that our responsibility to the American people went beyond that and that the highway bill itself should deal with the problem of financing. Once determined that we should deal with this distasteful but all important aspect of the problem, the first major decision to be made was whether the program should be financed on a deficit basis through borrowings or on a pay-as-you-go basis. H. R. 7494 reflecting the views of the President's Advisory Committee is a deficit plan and our committee rejected it, as did the Senate, and agreed to put the highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis. There can be no doubt this decision was a wise one. The plan in H. R. 7494 would pledge the revenues derived from highway users for a period of 30 years to pay for roads that are to be built in 10 years. What is to happen at the end of 10 years? Does anyone think that our roads will then be adequate for the following 20 years and that the Federal Government will not be called upon to contribute more than \$600 million per year after 10 years? We had best be realistic and recognize that this cannot be so. This seems to be clearly recognized by President Eisenhower who is quoted on page 2 of the Advisory Committee report as saying that after the completion of the 10-year program "we shall only have made a good start in the highways the country will need for a population estimated to be reached in 1970. Furthermore, this deficit financing plan

would result in the expenditure of \$11½ billion over the next 30 years in interest alone. To mortgage the future wealth of this country in peacetime to pay for a road program would seem to me to be the height of folly. I feel that a true appraisal of the overall effect of such an approach would be that it was a serious blow to national defense rather than the creation of an asset for the strengthening of our defenses. In short, our committee did not want our road program to be tainted with financial irresponsibility.

Putting the road program on a pay-as-you-go basis meant imposing taxes to help pay the bill. Normally, of course, the determination of what taxes to levy falls under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee but here we did not have a normal situation. In the first place, there was no dissent from the view that the users of the roads were the ones who should pay for them, thus narrowing to a limited area the taxes to be looked to in order to raise the needed revenue. Thus, there was no issue with respect to this problem which the Ways and Means Committee would normally reserve to itself. In the second place, the amount of revenue to be raised was not dependent upon a consideration of the whole Federal budget or broad fiscal policy, matters on which the Congress looks to the Ways and Means Committee, but rather upon the road program provided for by the Public Works Committee. Finally, the equitable allocation of the burden among the different classes of users was dependent upon considerations falling more particularly within the knowledge and experience of the Public Works Committee than the Ways and Means Committee. We, of course, sought and were generously given able technical assistance by the staff of the Ways and Means Committee and other experts who normally draft tax measures. In short, I am convinced that from a substantive standpoint there has been no encroachment by the Public Works Committee upon the prerogatives and jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

After hearings and a careful study of various tax proposals, the committee incorporated a section increasing the rates of the excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, the larger sized tires and tubes and trucks and buses, and imposing a new tax on the material used in retreading and recapping large tires. These proposals are estimated to increase general fund revenues by \$12.4 billion over the 16-year period beginning with fiscal year 1956 and ending with fiscal year 1971.

The existing tax rates on gasoline, diesel fuel, and large tires and tubes would produce about \$21.6 billion over this same period. Thus, assuming normal growth in highway usage, total revenue available will amount to \$34 billion and will cover 96 percent of the estimated total Federal expenditures for highways. The committee believes the improvement in the highway system which will result from its program will increase tax yields even further and thus eliminate this gap between these revenues and the highway expenditures provided under this bill.

I will discuss certain aspects of the tax provisions further as I go through the bill section by section.

At this point, having described the program provided for by H. R. 7474 and the tax provisions included to permit the accomplishment of this program on a pay-as-you-go basis, I wish to call your attention briefly to the minority views signed by four members of the committee, since their views relate principally to these two features.

The minority views take exception to the size of the program for the interstate system and to the inclusion of any tax provisions in the bill. One reason given for the opposition is that because of the size of the program it would be inflationary because of a shortage of cement and of highway engineers. Evidence presented before the committee satisfied the majority that present capacity and planned expansion of material production would be ample to meet the program provided for by the bill. The signers of the minority views recommend the substitution of a plan calling for an expenditure of \$1 billion annually on the interstate highway system for a 10-year period. In discussing the taxes it is stated by the minority that they have no objection to a soundly developed program of user taxes to bear the larger share of the increased cost of the interstate system, but they take various exceptions to the tax proposals included in H. R. 7474. The objections voiced did not seem to the majority to be well grounded and it was felt that they stem primarily from opposition to the inclusion of any tax provisions in the highway bill. The signers of the minority views recognized that under their substitute proposal with no provision made for increased taxes there would be a substantial gap between the cost of the program and any revenues that might reasonably be anticipated. It is to be noted that the minority also renounced the plan called for by H. R. 7494. The substitute proposal of the minority is basically a deficit-financing proposal with the taxpayers having to carry the burden which should properly rest upon the users of the highways. It should also be mentioned that in individual views filed by one member of the committee agreement was expressed with the views of the minority with regard to their position with respect to the size of the program on the interstate system. However, he expressed disagreement with the views of the minority with regard to the tax provisions and agreement with the policy of the majority in putting the highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis through the levying of new taxes.

Another important provision of H. R. 7474 is one having to do with size and weight limitations. While fundamentally a problem of State regulation, the committee felt that if the Federal Government is to pay 90 percent of the cost of the national system it is entitled to protection against damage to that investment, caused by excessive loads on the highways. Hence provisions have been included in the bill to withhold apportionment of funds for the national system from any State which increases

its maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles over those permitted in State laws in effect on March 1, 1956, or than the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials, whichever are greater. This is an entirely reasonable provision. The proposed interstate system will be built to specifications substantially in accord with those recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials. It should be clearly understood that this provision will not cause any State to reduce the size and weight limitations now in effect. This is identical with a provision in the Senate bill except that in that bill the date governing State laws is July 1, 1955, instead of March 1, 1956. H. R. 7494 does not contain any provision dealing with sizes and weights but we think it highly important that any bill passed by the Congress contain such a provision. It is worthy of note that none of the minority views or the separate or individual views took any exception to the inclusion of such a provision.

Another feature of H. R. 7474 is a provision having to do with the relocation of facilities of public utilities caused by the reconstruction of highways. Section 7 of the bill provides that 50 percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid systems may, on the recommendation of the State highway department, be paid from Federal funds whenever under the laws of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility. It is also provided that in no case shall the reimbursement on any project exceed 2 percent of the total approved cost of such project. In view of the magnitude of the proposed highway program, and the resulting heavy financial burdens on the utilities that could not reasonably have been anticipated, the committee felt that it would be fair and equitable to include a provision such as I have described. A similar provision was included in the bill passed by the Senate. H. R. 7494 contains no provision similar to this. Exception to this provision was taken by the five signers of the additional minority views.

The last provision to which I wish to call attention at this time is one contained in section 11, providing that all workmen employed on the initial construction work on projects in the interstate system authorized by this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing in similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. No similar provision is contained in S. 1048 as passed by the Senate or in H. R. 7494. In separate views signed by two members of the committee exception was taken to the inclusion of this provision.

At this point I should like to indicate to you the coverage of H. R. 7474 by describing briefly and in general terms the content of each section of the bill. For the most part I think it unnecessary to give you the detailed provisions of each section nor to comment on them as the

most important points have already been covered in my previous discussion of the bill. This, however, will not be true with respect to section 4, the tax provision, which will require further detailed comment.

Section 1 of the bill contains the authorization for appropriations for the regular Federal-aid program other than the interstate system for the fiscal year 1957 and includes an outline of the program for the next 13 years through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, in the form of a declaration of intent. The details of this section have already been presented to you.

Section 2 contains the authorization of appropriations for the construction and improvement of the interstate system for a 13-year period beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and extending through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The authorizations start with \$1.2 billion for the year 1957 and gradually increase to a maximum of \$2.3 billion for the years 1964 and 1965, and then gradually descend to the level of \$1.2 billion for the years 1968 and 1969. The total of these authorizations is \$24 billion. The committee is of the view that with a program of this magnitude and of this duration spelled out in advance, and with the gradual acceleration provided for by this plan, the road-construction industry will be able to keep pace and thus avoid the inflationary effects feared by the minority. Section 2 also provides for the manner of determining the sums to be apportioned each year among the States. The sums are to be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the national system in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the entire national system, as set forth in computations filed by the Bureau of Public Roads in House Document No. 120, 84th Congress. S. 1048 provides that the money for the interstate system shall be apportioned in the same manner as now provided by law. The apportionment provision in H. R. 7474 seems much preferable to that in the Senate bill for it is designed to insure the uniform completion of the entire interstate system whereas the Senate provision does not necessarily insure that result. The size and weight limitation provision already described is also to be found in section 2. Following the size and weight limitation provision there is a direction to the Secretary of Commerce to expedite the conduct of tests by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads and certain others for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit such recommendations to Congress not later than March 1, 1958.

Section 3 would permit up to 20 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on Federal-aid, primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems, respectively, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to any of the others, when requested by the State highway de-

partment and approved by the governor and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest. The current rate of transfer permissible and not applicable to the interstate system is 10 percent. State highway officials have urged the increase of this percentage to 25 percent. The committee determined that a figure of 20 percent was reasonable and that this greater latitude and flexibility was desirable. This figure of 20 percent is the same as that included in S. 1048.

This brings us to section 4, containing the taxing provisions, which is probably the most important section of the bill, or if not the most important section, at least of coequal importance with sections 1 and 2 of the bill setting forth the road program. Its importance stems from the fact that our committee is firmly convinced that if there is no means provided for financing the road program there will be no law establishing such a program. Quite understandably, this section was the most controversial in the entire bill. The committee had two principal objectives; the first was to provide a scale of taxes that would produce sufficient revenue so that when added to the revenue anticipated from existing taxes on fuel, large tires and tubes, there would be sufficient money coming in to pay for the program provided for in sections 1 and 2 of the bill. As I have already indicated to you, the \$12.4 billion expected to be raised from the new taxes, when added to the \$21.6 billion expected to be derived from the existing taxes on the items named, will cover about 96 percent of the estimated total Federal expenditures for highways during the 13-year program. The second major objective of the committee was to divide the burden of the new taxes equitably among the various classes of users. This the committee feels it has done.

The taxes imposed by section 4 include an increase of the tax on gasoline and special fuels from 2 cents to 3 cents; an increase in the tax on diesel fuel from 2 cents to 4 cents; an increase in manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, truck trailers, and buses from 8 percent to 10 percent; an increase in the tax on tires larger than 8.50 by 18, used on trucks, trailers, and buses, from 5 cents to 15 cents per pound; an increase in the tax on tires larger than 7.25 by 18 but not larger than 8.50 by 18, used on trucks, trailers, and buses, from 5 cents to 8 cents per pound; an increase in the tax on inner tubes for tires larger than 8.50 by 18 from 9 cents to 15 cents per pound; and a new tax on camelback or recapping material having a crown width of 6 inches or more amounting to 15 cents per pound.

Exemptions from the increases are provided for nonhighway uses and for municipal transit systems. In view of the fact that the proposed new taxes are designed as user charges to pay for the highways it was deemed to be both logical and equitable that off-highway uses of both fuel and tires be exempted, as for example in connection with the operation of farm machinery.

In view of the importance of this section I should like to explain to you briefly

the manner in which we arrived at the various taxes. Knowing approximately the amount of money we had to come up with, it soon became obvious to the committee that a very large proportion of the total would have to be derived from an increase in the tax on gasoline, as this appeared to be the only feasible source from which anything like the required sum could be obtained. This becomes clear when you realize that of the \$12.4 billion to be raised over the 16-year period, \$9.3 billion of it, or 75 percent, is to be derived from an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax on gasoline. Furthermore, this is a reasonable feature of a user charge system because it does reach out and tap all of the users of the highways.

With this as the basic tax provision, certain natural consequences followed. The first of these, and one of relatively little significance, was that the tax on certain special fuels should similarly be increased from 2 cents to 3 cents. Another was that the tax on diesel fuel, which is becoming more and more to be used as the fuel in heavy commercial vehicles, should be increased. Here, however, there was a question as to how much the increase should be. Currently the rate on diesel fuel is at the same level as the rate on gasoline, namely, 2 cents a gallon. When considered as a user charge this is inequitable to the users of gasoline because vehicles using diesel oil obtain on the average about 1.6 times as much mileage as vehicles of similar size and weight using gasoline. Thus, to equate the tax to terms of the relative use of the highways, the tax on diesel fuel should be approximately 1.6 times as high as the tax on gasoline.

After the increases proposed in this bill go into effect, the Federal tax on gasoline will be 3 cents. Accordingly, it would seem appropriate that the tax on diesel fuel should be close to 5 cents per gallon. As I have pointed out the increase in the tax on diesel fuel is only to 4 cents a gallon. Frankly, this is one of the compromises that it was necessary to make in connection with the consideration of this bill in the committee, and while I personally felt that a 5-cent tax was more appropriate on diesel fuel, I am willing to abide by the judgment of the majority of the committee and support the tax of 4 cents a gallon on diesel fuel, provided all the other provisions of this section receive support.

Another consequence that flowed from the decision of the committee to impose as a basic tax an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax on gasoline was the realization that the across-the-board imposition of such a tax would result in a heavy discrimination against the private automobile and in favor of the heavy commercial vehicles. Evidence before the committee indicated that for each ton-mile of use of the highways a heavy truck paid only about one-fifth as much gasoline tax as the average automobile paid. Accordingly, when heavy commercial vehicles pay the same rate of gasoline tax as private automobiles, this discrimination against the private automobile is created, and the committee felt that some additional tax

applicable only to the heavy commercial vehicle should be included in the proposed new tax structure.

It was suggested by a member of the committee that tires served to reflect use of the highways in terms of weight and distance because the heavy vehicle requires more and larger tires, and the greater the mileage of such a vehicle the more often the tires would have to be replaced. Accordingly, it was determined that a tax in the form of so many cents per pound on the rubber in the tires used by the vehicles of the size and type so greatly favored by the uniform gasoline tax would meet the requirements of the situation. Data presented to the committee indicated that the size of the tires used by such vehicles were those larger than 8.50 by 18. The question then remained as to what the rate per pound should be on such tires.

Evidence was presented to the committee that indicated that it would take a tax of 41 cents per pound on rubber to overcome the discrimination against the private motorist created by a 1 cent a gallon gasoline tax. No competent evidence refuting this figure was presented to the committee, but it was felt that an increase in the tax on rubber for large tires of this amount would perhaps be too drastic a tax at this time and that a lesser rate of tax should be imposed. The committee finally arrived at a tax of 15 cents per pound on the large tires. This is a very modest tax and in my judgment too low, but again I am willing to abide by the decision of the committee in this respect. It is estimated that at the outset the increase in the tax on large tires will bring in approximately \$45 million revenue per year and that over the 16-year period it will average approximately \$55 million per year.

The committee felt that in addition to the increase to be imposed on large tires there should also be a somewhat smaller increase on medium size tires for commercial vehicles because while the discrimination in their favor in comparison with the private automobile is not nearly as marked as in the case of the heavy trucks, some discrimination does exist and also it is anticipated that enormous benefit would be derived from the new roads by this class of vehicles. Accordingly, the committee concluded that an increase in the tax on rubber in tires of this size of 3 cents per pound should be included. The tax on medium tires is expected to produce about \$9 million at the outset and ultimately reach \$14 million, with an average of about \$11.5 million.

The tax on the so-called camelback, or retreading materials, is a natural corollary of the tax on large tires. It is imposed only on camelback of the size normally used on the large size tires. One important consideration in this connection was that it was feared that without such a tax various people might be inclined to recap tires more often than was safe in an attempt to avoid buying new tires carrying the newly imposed taxes.

The increase in the manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers from 8 to 10 percent is certainly fully justified for there is no reason why

private automobiles should be paying 10 percent as they are now and trucks, buses, and trailers pay some lesser amount. Particularly is this so in view of the highly favorable treatment that they receive through the imposition of the common rate of tax on gasoline. Thus you have a brief explanation of how the committee arrived at its conclusions to impose the various taxes in section 4.

Despite the conviction of the committee that the taxes being imposed on heavy trucks were extremely moderate, the committee took pains to investigate to determine what the probable overall effect would be on the trucking industry as a consequence of the construction of the new roads called for by the program and the imposition of the taxes provided for in section 4. Data obtained from reliable trucking sources indicate that it is the judgment of the industry itself that the proposed new roads will probably result in savings annually to the trucking industry of over \$1 billion. Probably the best means of comparing the savings anticipated from the construction of new throughway type highways such as the proposed interstate system and the cost of the taxes to be imposed by this bill is in the terms of cost per vehicle mile. According to truck studies, operations over roads of throughway design as compared to other roads will result in savings of at least 5 cents per vehicle mile. All of the increased taxes imposed by section 4 taken together would increase operating costs for heavy trucks approximately one-half cent per vehicle mile. There can be no question about the modest nature of the taxes being imposed upon the trucking industry by this bill. If there is anything wrong with the tax provision insofar as it imposes taxes upon heavy trucks, it would be because the level of the taxes is too low, not too high. However, even if the tax is not adequate, the bill does establish the principle of the user charge, which is a great step forward.

The president of the American Automobile Association supported the taxes on the heavy trucks but felt that the tax on heavy tires should be at the rate of approximately 50 cents per pound instead of 15 cents. Representatives of the railroads also supported the user charge on trucks in the form of the tax on large tires but felt that in order to overcome what they regard as the subsidization of the heavy trucks by the private automobile through the payment of an equal rate of 3 cents per gallon as proposed on gasoline, it would take a tax of approximately \$1.20 per pound on tires. The committee took into consideration all of the conflicting views and reached the conclusion that the proposal now contained in H. R. 7474 is fair and equitable as between users and will result in a soundly financed highway program.

Returning now to an analysis of the bill, section 4 also contains certain technical provisions for the imposition of floor taxes and also for refunds on floor stocks at the end of the tax period. It will not be necessary to explain these in detail.

Section 5 permits the Secretary of Commerce to acquire lands for the new interstate system and provides the means of controlling access to the roads to be built as part of the interstate system.

Section 6 permits the Secretary of Commerce to make certain advances to the State for the acquisition of rights-of-way. This is an important provision which it is believed will result in substantially reduced costs of acquisition of rights-of-way for the new interstate system.

Section 7 contains the provisions with respect to relocation of utility facilities, which I have already discussed.

Section 8 declares it to be the sense of the Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid system should be improved to standards adequate for national defense and national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary of Commerce is to submit to the Congress by February 1, 1957, and annually thereafter, a report together with recommendations regarding the progress in attaining this objective.

Section 9 provides that the Secretary in connection with the undesignated mileage of the national system shall take into consideration elimination of bottlenecks in evacuation routes leading from target areas as designated by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Section 10 provides for agreements between the Secretary and the State highway departments to control access to the national system. It also provides that these agreements shall contain provisions necessary to insure to the users of the system benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services adjacent to the highways in the system.

Section 11 contains the Davis-Bacon Act provisions already discussed.

Section 12 authorizes the inclusion in the national system of toll roads, bridges, or tunnels under certain specified conditions.

Section 13 would broaden the definition of the term "construction," as contained in section 1 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, by adding thereto the following words: "cost of relocation of tenants, cost of demolition of structures, or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites."

Section 14 contains certain administrative changes deemed necessary to carry out the greatly expanded program provided for by H. R. 7474. It provides for the addition of certain top supervisory and administrative grades. It also changes the name of the Bureau of Public Roads to the Public Roads Administration and abolishes the office of the Commissioner of Public Roads. It also provides that the new administration be headed by an administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 15 repeals so much of section 1 and section 2 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorize appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. This was appropriate because the new bill provides authorization of appropriations for that year.

Section 16 provides that section 13 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950 relating to hearings for projects involving bypasses shall not be applicable to projects on the national system constructed pursuant to section 2 of this act.

Section 17 provides that all provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Acts not inconsistent with this act shall remain in full force and effect and that all inconsistent provisions are repealed.

Section 18 is a separability clause.

Section 19 provides that this act may be cited as the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955."

This, gentlemen, is the bill presented to you for your consideration by the Committee on Public Works. In my judgment it is a realistic bill providing for a sound program of highway construction, soundly financed. In view of the complexity of the problems involved and the diversity of the interests affected, I think there was a remarkable degree of agreement among the members of the Public Works Committee. I recommend this bill for your favorable consideration and support.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. FALLON, the acting chairman of our committee, has presented to the House clearly and distinctly the provisions of the committee bill. It is my purpose to present to the House what is contained in the President's bill or the Clay committee bill, which embraces a different philosophy from that reported by our committee.

The subject of highways in this country is not new. Although we have the finest network of highways of any country in the world today, yet through the years and because of war they have been neglected and we are far behind in preserving or providing the necessary highways for our people. We must provide an adequate system to support the economy of our country which travels on the roads of the Nation today. The purpose of this legislation is to see whether or not we can provide a method by which the American people shall have a system of highways adequate for their needs, adequate to carry the 70 percent of the economy of the Nation, because that is about the percent of our business that now travels on the highways of the United States. Knowing that we are far behind as a Nation in the construction of roads, the President in 1954 conceived the idea of appointing a commission now known as the Clay Commission—by the way, it was a bipartisan commission—to study the question of our need for roads in the United States and make a report. That committee or commission was in session over 4 months, and it is my information that they contacted nearly every segment of the American economy, business, labor, agriculture, industry, in order to get all of the information they could on which to file a proper report with the President. That report is now known as the Clay report, as I have said.

Two bills were introduced at the beginning of the year, known as H. R. 4260 and H. R. 4261, the first one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY],

the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the other by myself, which embodied substantially the provisions and the recommendations of the Clay Commission. With few minor amendments and one major amendment, that report containing the recommendations is embodied in the bill which I will offer today as an amendment to the committee bill, so that the House may have its choice.

The committee bill provides a method of taxation to be immediately assessed to pay for the roads. The Clay bill, or the bill I have introduced, provides a different method of securing the money, namely, the issuance of bonds to run 30 years in order to spread the burden over a longer period of time and also to provide a way so that more people and more cars will help to pay the bill instead of fastening it on the people in the next 10 or 15 years.

There are no new taxes provided in the Clay bill or my bill. Present taxes remain unchanged and no new ones added. My bill leaves it exactly as it is now. It does not contain two things that are in the committee bill. It does not contain the Bacon-Davis provision. It does not contain the reimbursement of utilities. It does not contain the provision for reimbursement to the States for roads already built.

What the acting chairman of the committee has said in reference to the report and the committee bill clearly indicates, of course, that only 12 hours were spent upon the taxing feature of the Fallon bill. I do not agree that this is a gag rule because section 4 of the bill covers the subject of taxation. We all know, at least those who have been here any number of years, that you cannot bring a tax measure to the floor of the House in any other manner and hope for any success for final conclusion on it except under a closed rule. So I believe the rule adopted is fair. I know that amendments may be offered to the bill which I introduced—H. R. 7494. I do not know exactly what they may be. Be that as it may, the bill will be offered and Members will have an opportunity to express their will on the kind of a road bill they think we ought to have.

I remember well what the chairman said in reference to the action of the other body; that they had voted down the Clay bill, or the philosophy contained in it, by a vote of better than 2 to 1. I do not believe the House of Representatives should always be guided by what another body does in regard to legislation. We have the right to express our views. We represent the American people. I think they expect us to present to them the kind of legislation which will in the best way provide what they need the most, namely, an adequate highway system to meet our fast-growing economy.

Why do I say that the Clay bill in my judgment is the better bill? We have 58½ million registered cars in the United States today. The Nation is growing at the rate of about 2½ million in population every year. In addition to that, we are adding to the highways of the Nation every year between 2½ or 3 million new cars. The industry has been providing about 6 million new cars a year, but

3 million old cars leave the highways each year. This leaves a net gain of about 3 million cars a year on our highways. In 10 years that means 30 million more cars will be on the highways of this country in addition to the 58 million we now have. It shows the great need, and also I think the great emergency that faces us, to provide an adequate system of highways at the earliest possible time.

As to taxes, my own opinion is that inasmuch as the interstate system—and that is what we are talking about here today—does involve the question of the Nation's security and national defense, that all of the people of the United States should share in paying for the new roads through the issuance of bonds rather than assess new taxes. I believe the people would be perfectly willing to pay, just as we are doing now, and they would not be unduly burdened by paying the additional interest if spread over a 30-year period.

I am sure that every Member in this House can think of project after project in his district that has been financed and constructed in the same manner as we propose to build the roads under the Clay bill or my bill.

Schoolhouses, waterworks, sewer systems, and nearly every great public project in your State and district, with few exceptions, are paid for by borrowing the money, issuing bonds and paying interest thereon. They pay for them as they use them. That is exactly the philosophy of the President's or the Clay bill.

I have heard something said about a Presidential veto. That is the first time that subject came to my ears. I know of no road bill that the President has said he was going to veto. If that has gotten abroad, I certainly did not hear it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman if the substitute he proposes to offer has specific provisions as to how these bonds are to be paid off? Does it earmark any revenues for that purpose?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not believe under the laws of the land you can definitely earmark revenue, but at least there is a moral connection between the revenue from gas and other fuel taxes from which the bonds and interest would be paid over a period of years.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. As I understand, the formula is contained in the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; I omitted to mention that.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman explain what the formula is with respect to matching funds?

Mr. DONDERO. Under the 1954 Act, the formula on the ABC roads is 50-50, just as it has always been. The Clay bill provides that the \$622 million needed for matching funds in these 3 categories of roads remains the same, and the amount received above that will be given to the corporation under the bill.

That would amortize the bonds and interest as they come due.

Mr. MORANO. Is it estimated that there will be more than \$622 million coming in?

Mr. DONDERO. There will be.

Mr. MORANO. So that you will have excess money to help pay interest on the bonds and retire them?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. The tax on gas, diesel fuel, and other user taxes now amounts to about \$2,300,000,000 a year.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I believe the gentleman ought to state that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, when he appeared before the committee, made the positive statement that could sell these bonds, and very readily.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. There is no question about the bonds being sold. Undoubtedly it would follow the same rule we adopted in the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, where bonds were provided for payment.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman have any information as to how much interest may be on those bonds?

Mr. DONDERO. It has been stated as eleven or eleven and a half billion in the 30 years they will run.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I think everybody in this House, and certainly every witness that appeared before our committee, acknowledges we must have additional roads. The road situation has reached a condition where there is very little safety. We are killing more than 100 people a day and injuring over 3,000 people a day.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am for doing something about the highways. Our highways are 20 years behind the rest of our Nation's economy. It is pretty near time that we set up some funds to correct the evils of the past. We have spent too little money on highways in the past, and that neglect is what people are suffering from now.

We have heard our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], explain the bill. We have heard the ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], explain his part of the bill and what he thinks about it. They are both very able men. I propose to vote for a highway bill. Whichever bill this body feels is the better bill will have my approval. I do think there are many things to be considered. There is very little difference, if any, between the Clay bill and the Fallon bill. There is no difference in the amount of money involved or any difference in the way the money will be applied. A formula has been worked out, which I think is most equitable. In the past we have expended the money in the respective States, so far as Federal aid is concerned, on the basis of population and on the basis of the number of miles of roads in the State and so on. This bill does not do that. It is a more equitable bill. Whether you have the Clay bill or the Fallon bill, the same

application appears so far as the allocation of funds is concerned. There are 40,000 miles of highways to be brought up to a high standard by both bills. The allocation of funds is predicated upon what the cost in the respective States will be. In other words, if each State had 100 miles of roads or 1,000 miles of roads, they would not all get the same amount of money because the costs in some States are very much higher than in others. In States like New York, California and Pennsylvania, the costs are high. In the Western States the costs are low. So that annually you would get one-tenth or one-twelfth of the amount required under either bill, depending on the number of years, to apply to that percentage of the roads in your State so that all States could have their roads completed at the same time.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey in appearing before our committee, pointed out that there were two routes we could take. We could take the Clay bill using the bonds and setting up a corporation or we could provide taxes. He said he preferred the bond route, but that the other was very satisfactory to him. As a matter of fact, he said from the standpoint of inflation—there was more inflation in the bonds than there was in paying-as-you-go. He also said he did not know any Secretary of the Treasury who would not welcome additional funds coming into the Treasury.

The thing that concerns me about the so-called Clay bill and the bond route is this: We have a certain income coming in from gasoline taxes and diesel-fuel taxes. Those are the only two tax features we have being considered in the Clay bill. From those two sources the annual revenue at the present time is approximately \$1,019,000,000. The present allocation for primary and secondary roads runs something over \$600 million. We have estimated the increase as we go over the years of the additional taxes which we will get from gasoline and diesel fuel. Those are the only taxes that would be considered, that is, to pay off the bonded indebtedness and to pay for the upkeep and improvements of the primary, secondary, and urban roads. The bonded indebtedness will be paid off over a period of 30 years, and it is going to take all this surplus money that we do not spend for the primary and secondary roads to pay off the bonds and the interest. There is not a man or woman in this House who does not know that you must improve the secondary roads and the primary roads over these 30 years.

We are going to have a serious situation in regard to the increasing number of cars on the highways, 3 million a year. In 15 years we are going to have a condition probably more serious, if that is possible, than you have today.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman calls to the attention of the House the fact that in the report we show that 100 persons are killed daily on our highways and 3,000 sent to hospitals. We also had

testimony before our committee to the effect that in the last 10 years 300,000 lives were lost on the highways; the economic loss was \$35 billion; and that we hospitalized 8 million people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. FALLON. And the forecast for the future is that this loss is going to increase alarmingly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is going to increase alarmingly, and unless we get this job started immediately, I think the responsibility must rest on the shoulders of each Member of this House.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Very briefly.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman made the statement that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey had more or less agreed that there were two ways of financing this project, one by raising taxes, and he approved this. Is it not true the gentleman would imply that he approved this particular tax program?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say this to the gentleman, he said he had checked over these figures and there was very little difference between what we showed and the results of the Treasury Department experts.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. But does the gentleman mean to imply that he said that this is the right proportion of tax and on the right items to raise the money? I want to make that clear.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He did not say that because he did not appear there as an expert on raising money for highways. He did say he would welcome a payment plan, that if a choice had to be made between two plans he would prefer the Clay bill. That is what he said.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman will remember that he said in answer to questions I asked him that he would have no objection to the Fallon bill.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. But did he say that the tax on rubber was just right?

Mr. BURNSIDE. He said this tax would be all right.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Did he say that the excise tax was just right, that the diesel-fuel tax was just right?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for two Members to engage in an argument between themselves. I refuse to yield further. I tried to answer the question.

Fifteen years from now we are going to have a much more difficult situation on our highways. Under the Clay bill our highway funds would be mortgaged for 30 years. Where are we going to get the money to keep up the primary and secondary roads that tie into the interstate system? And that is something that is very necessary to do.

Secretary Humphrey did say that we would not in this bill take money from the general fund, that for whatever money we use we must either issue bonds or create taxes. That was the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I think he was very frank and a very splendid witness, so far as I am concerned.

I shall not take much more of your time, but for a great many years I have

been trying diligently to obtain more money for highways, because I have had occasion to know of the need. We must build a better road base, we must build lanes that are wider, we must build highways that are wider. It is not sufficient to have a lane that is 9½ feet wide when the trucks themselves are 8½ feet. We must have 12-foot lanes and a 6-lane interstate system instead of 2 lanes.

And I would like to speak of the death situation. For every 2 people we kill on a four-lane highway with a comparable mileage we kill 7 people on a two-lane highway. We have these narrow bridges, nearly 10,000 of them, on the 40,000-mile interstate highway system, bridges that are entirely inadequate.

I am most regretful that the Treasury cannot see its way clear to provide some of the money so badly needed, because when we kill over a hundred people a day on the highways it is more than all the men who were killed in the Korean war. Twenty-four thousand people were killed there, but we kill from 36,000 to 38,000 a year on the highways of America. I think the time has come when something should be done to correct this situation.

I, as I am sure was every other member of the committee, was hopeful that an adequate highway development program could be carried out without any additional tax. Weeks of careful and conscientious research and study provided convincing evidence that this could not be done. It was either a reasonable and equitable tax increase or adoption of a plan that would cost \$11.5 billion in bond interest alone and tie up our normal tax income for roadbuilding purposes for the next 30 years. That freeze of funds could result only in another serious deterioration in our highways and places us in a position of having once more to seek additional income to provide traffic arteries adequate to cope with our constantly increasing motor vehicle population.

To burden the American taxpayers with \$11.5 billion additional, of which not \$1 would build roads, even though the taxpayment were extended over the 30-year period does not make sense. It is not good business.

It is entirely possible that the tax increases proposed in this bill may be inequitable, insofar as some segments of the taxpaying group are concerned. The burden may be disproportionately distributed. But I can assure you that any inequity, if there be one, is not the result of prejudice or bias on the part of any committee member. If such an inequity should be shown to exist by even brief experience, it can and will be readily corrected.

It is well to bear in mind, I believe, that financial considerations in this legislation are not confined to taxation alone. The roads to be constructed under this program will result in enormous savings for owners and operators of vehicles. Conservative estimates made by traffic experts are that operating cost of the passenger cars will be reduced at least 1 cent a mile, while for larger vehicles they will amount to 4 cents a mile. Our deteriorated and inadequate highways have been costing us many human lives each year. It is estimated

that this annual toll of 38,000 will be cut by at least 5,000 by improved roads. There will be material reduction in the more than 1 million injuries resulting from traffic accidents as well as in the \$3 billion a year in property damage and other losses incurred on our present deficient highway system.

The attitude of the American public in general, the great rank and file of the men and women who own and operate motor vehicles every day, has been most gratifying. Very few have voiced any opposition to the proposed gasoline-tax increase. To my mind, that is evidence beyond refutation that they are willing to pay for better roads, that they recognize the need for those roads, and that the proposed gasoline-tax increase is the most sensible way of investing in those roads.

Personally, I would be very happy indeed if we could devise some magical way of solving our highway problem, so that our defense effort and economic welfare would not be seriously hampered, without resorting to any tax increase, without the issuance of bonds which would add to our indebtedness and increase our interest burden. But the Nation's best fiscal experts, including the Secretary of the Treasury, told our committee what would be necessary in order to carry out the contemplated highway program. We agreed upon what we believed would be the wisest and most economical course in the long run. This legislation is the result. I believe it is entitled to the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made. It has been clear, open, and all embracing. The gentleman's statement is like his character.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity first of paying my respects to the distinguished chairman of the majority party, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLOON]. He has been most fair in our deliberations. He has given the minority party every consideration except for about 30 days when they had their own private little party and we Republicans were not invited. Outside of that he has been most considerate. I also want to pay my respects to the ranking minority member of our committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the junior member from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

I want to join with the gentleman from New Mexico in his statement that, in his opinion, the American people want better roads and they are willing to pay for better roads. But, let us be honest. If you want roads you are going to have to pay for them.

There are two ways of paying for these roads, one in the form of bonds, as is suggested in the Clay Committee report,

and, second, by means of taxes, which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLOON] has submitted for your consideration in the bill which came out of our committee.

I resent very, very much the inference from some people that the Public Works Committee did not give proper consideration to the highway measure. Let me say that the Clay Committee bill had hearings before our committee from April 18 to June 1, inclusive, 90 percent of that, if you please, on the interstate system. Last year we had 13 weeks of hearings on the intrastate system. So, certainly, we have given the road program every consideration.

It has been suggested to us, and I think rightly, that if you were to bring an authorized highway bill to the floor of this House for consideration everybody would vote for the highway bill and then if you brought a revenue-raising measure later to the floor for consideration everyone would vote against the revenue-raising measure. So, let us be honest, let us have a backbone where some wishbones are. Let us live up to our responsibility. If we are going to vote an authorization for the expenditure of \$25 billion let us have the intestinal fortitude to say: Yes, we are going to raise the money to pay for it.

As I said before, you can do it in two ways, by bonds or by taxes. No one likes taxes. It is rather amusing to hear some of my good friends get up and raise the question, "Did Secretary Humphrey say that he was in favor of 5 cents or 7 cents or 9 cents?" Of course he did not. We did not ask him the question. We were trying to determine how much money was necessary and then to try to get an equitable tax for all people, if you please. But, regardless of what taxes you put on some people, they will insist that they want the other people to absorb that particular tax. Now, that is the thing that we are faced with. Nobody likes a tax proposal, but let us give the people a road bill that will be satisfactory, and will carry an equitable tax program.

Two years ago in the 1954 Highway Act we authorized and appropriated the approximate amount of money that was collected through the gasoline and diesel tax, \$966 million. What are we doing in this particular bill? We are saying to the people, "You who use the roads are going to pay for them." You could not satisfy some people if you took off all the tax except possibly one-tenth of 1 percent. They want good roads, but they want somebody else to pay for them.

Now, the Clay Committee report, which I am advocating, is the result of many weeks of study by a nonpartisan group. It was adopted by the Governors Conference. Not only a majority of the executives, if you please, but nearly every single governor signed that report.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Did the gentleman say all 48 governors endorsed the Clay report?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think the gentleman is incorrect. I think if he will check, he will find he is in error.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If the gentleman will name a governor who did not sign it, I will be very happy to stand corrected.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I am authorized to speak for only one, the Governor of Mississippi. He did not sign it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Of course, I may be in error. I know that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has opposed the highway bill ever since we started it, and probably his Governor is doing the same thing. So, I may be in error, and if I am, I stand corrected. We will say, then, that 47 governors signed the report.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I still raise a question about that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. So we will say that 47 governors signed it. But, it was signed by a large majority. Put it that way. And I was told that it was a strong majority, and finally unanimous, so I thought. But, I recall now that the gentleman from Mississippi did raise a point of order in the committee that his Governor had not signed it. So, I withdraw the name of the Governor of Mississippi. However, the rest of the governors favored the Clay report. Why? Because we were adequately taking care of the ABC roads along with the interstate system, and we are not putting an exorbitant tax on anyone. You say that is not good business? You farmers, if you decide you have a milk market and need an extra cow, what do you do? You go to the bank and borrow the money and buy the cow. That is good business. And, we are doing it on a sound financial basis, and that is the reason I am pleading with you to back up the substitute that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan. In that way we can go along with a good highway program and give you just as many miles, and you are not going to put on a new tax that hurts anyone.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago President Eisenhower, along with the vast majority of the traveling public, recognized a need for an increased highway program. This was brought about by a full recognition of the bottlenecks in various localities which were most disastrous to both a civilian and military defense program. It was also brought about because of the recognition that approximately 36,000 lives were lost in highway accidents last year.

In order to get a full and complete picture of the needs and necessary expenditures, President Eisenhower appointed a nonpartisan commission to make a thorough study of the needs of our highway system. This study was headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, retired. After many weeks of hearings, they reported to the President their findings and made a recommendation that an adequate highway program could be established without additional taxes, the financing being handled by issuance of bonds dependent upon anticipated revenue.

The President submitted the so-called Clay report to the Congress with the understanding that it was a basis on which the Congress could establish an adequate highway program to meet our civilian and military needs. The program was incorporated in legislation presented in the House of Representatives by the

gentleman from New York, Congressman BUCKLEY, chairman of the Public Works Committee, H. R. 4260; and Congressman DONDERO, ranking Member from the State of Michigan, H. R. 4261.

Hearings were held and many, many witnesses appeared before our committee and a large majority, including a full report on the governors conference which represented all the governors of the United States, were in favor of the Clay Committee report.

Before the hearings were finally completed, Speaker RAYBURN called a meeting of the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee to draft their own highway bill and, for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress, politics entered into the highway program. The Republican members of the Public Works Committee were not invited to the so-called session of the Democrats to draft highway legislation.

The result of that meeting was the introduction by Congressman FALLON of H. R. 7072 which called for a 6-cent diesel fuel tax, an increase of 4 cents; a 3-cent gasoline tax, which was an increase of 1 cent; a 50-cent-per-pound tire tax, which was an increase of 45 cents per pound on all tubes 9.00 by 20, which was an increase of 41 cents per pound. Retread or camelback tires had a new tax of 20 cents. The new bill as recommended by the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee before presentation to the full Public Works Committee included Republicans.

Mr. FALLON's bill, H. R. 7072, got such a hot reception from the general public because of its exorbitant and ridiculous tax increases that the acting chairman of the Public Works Committee, who was the author of H. R. 7072, asked that a subcommittee be appointed including Republicans. May I state here, Mr. Chairman, that I have served under many chairmen but never have I served under any that was more fair and willing to assume his responsibility than the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. At our first meeting, when we were called to consider H. R. 7072, Mr. FALLON attempted to explain to all of us that H. R. 7072 was his bill and was not authorized by the Democrat Party. Of course, to anyone on the Hill, this statement is without question one absorbing the blame of the Democrat Party. Knowing George, as we affectionately do, we are certain that he did not introduce any bill without the sanction of the leadership of his particular party. So, after many meetings that we know of, we can truthfully say that H. R. 7072 is the responsibility of the Democrat Party and not Mr. FALLON.

When our full Public Works Committee met relative to H. R. 7072, it was decided that the Republicans, the minority party, should be taken into consideration because the Democrats were bound and determined to put a tax upon the people to pay for their highway program.

A subcommittee was appointed, and this subcommittee reported H. R. 7474—and may I add I voted against it—and it is the stepchild of the bill that aroused such public sentiment, known as H. R. 7072.

The President's Commission—General Clay's commission—made a report that

it would give us as many miles of highways and in approximately the same period of time as H. R. 7072 without the additional taxes that is carried in the so-called Fallon or Democratic bill.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to include in my remarks the recommendations of the original Fallon bill, H. R. 7072, and the recommendations of its stepchild, H. R. 7474. Regardless of what the new bill might call for, the Republican Party certainly can be given credit for reducing the taxes on the users of our highways of diesel taxes from 6 cents a gallon to 4 cents a gallon. From tax on tires of 50 cents per pound to 10 cents per pound. From 50 cents per pound on large tubes to 6 cents a pound, and on the so-called camelback from 20 cents a pound to 15 cents a pound—material alone.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the Congress to enter into various arguments relative to other sections of the bill presented by the majority party of the Public Works Committee. The records will show, however, that we Republicans were very active and gave the controlling vote on whether or not off-the-road users would be exempt from the various taxes set forth by the Democratic Party in this legislation.

We all recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we need an adequate highway program, and we recognize that many want a highway program, but, in their opinion, the other person should pay for it. I am one who firmly believes, and my record will justify the statement, that I want an adequate highway program, with an equitable distribution of the taxes, which is certainly not exemplified in H. R. 7474.

Even though I am not in accord with H. R. 7474 as it is written, yet I firmly believe that if we cannot substitute the Clay Committee report for this legislation that the only chance we have for a highway program is to vote for H. R. 7474 and let the legislation go to a conference between the House and Senate and endeavor to iron out the differences. After all, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my previous statement that I think the American people want better highways and are willing to pay for them providing they are certain that this additional tax be used for highway purposes. I will do my best to bring this about.

H. R. 7474

Selected additional Federal excise taxes proposed rate and yield, fiscal years 1956-71

Gasoline, 1 cent additional.....	\$9,281,000,000
Diesel tax, 2 cents additional.....	512,000,000
Large tires (sizes larger than 8½ x 18), 10 cents additional.....	1,075,000,000
Inner Tubes for above tires, 6 cents additional.....	52,000,000
Tires (7¼ up to and including 8½ x 18), 3 cents additional.....	183,000,000
Manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, busses, and trailers, additional 2 percent.....	928,000,000
Camelback with a crown width of 6 inches or more, 15 cents per pound.....	395,000,000

Total..... 12,426,000,000

H. R. 7072, FALLON BILL

Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads—Selected Federal excise taxes, existing and proposed

Item	Fiscal 1955			Fiscal 1956-70		
	Present	Proposed	Difference	Present	Proposed	Difference
1. Diesel tax:						
Rate.....cents per gallon.....	2	6		2	6	
Yield.....dollars.....	23, 219, 000	69, 657, 000	46, 438, 000	476, 850, 000	1, 430, 550, 000	953, 700, 000
2. Gasoline tax:						
Rate.....cents per gallon.....	2	3		2	3	
Yield.....dollars.....	925, 362, 000	1, 388, 043, 000	462, 681, 000	18, 597, 150, 000	27, 895, 725, 000	9, 298, 575, 000
3. Tires 9.00×20 and over (weighing 90 pounds or more):						
Rate.....cents per pound.....	5	50		5	50	
Yield.....dollars.....	22, 580, 000	225, 800, 000	203, 220, 000	500, 540, 000	5, 005, 400, 000	4, 504, 860, 000
4. All other tires:						
Rate.....cents per pound.....	5	5		5	5	
Yield.....dollars.....	109, 130, 000	109, 130, 000		2, 419, 760, 000	2, 419, 760, 000	
5. Tubes 9.00×20 and over:						
Rate.....cents per pound.....	9	50		9	50	
Yield.....dollars.....	3, 252, 000	18, 065, 000	14, 813, 000	72, 082, 000	400, 455, 000	328, 373, 000
6. All other tubes:						
Rate.....cents per pound.....	9	9		9	9	
Yield.....dollars.....	8, 201, 000	8, 201, 000		181, 818, 000	181, 818, 000	
7. Camelback:						
Rate.....cents per pound.....		20			20	
Yield.....dollars.....		46, 000, 000	46, 000, 000		829, 950, 000	829, 950, 000
Total, yield.....dollars.....	1, 091, 744, 000	1, 864, 896, 000	773, 152, 000	22, 248, 200, 000	38, 163, 658, 000	15, 915, 458, 000

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, everybody is agreed that this Nation desperately needs and earnestly wants more, wider, better and safer highways. Everybody desires to eliminate the 36,000 deaths and the hundreds of thousands of injuries that occur each year on our Nation's highways. When we spend money to better highways, we get it back from the savings that are made, the savings in hospital and medical bills, the savings in wear and tear on our automobiles, trucks and tires. We get it back in the saving on insurance rates automobile owners pay. We get back the money we spend on highways. There is no controversy over that.

So let us here today talk about some of the things which are in controversy. There are four matters in controversy. The first of those is the proposal to give twenty-five to fifty million dollars to the traction companies of the Nation's great cities. This bill, H. R. 7474, provides that we shall take money away from the gasoline and tire users and give twenty-five to fifty million dollars of that money to the traction companies of the big cities. These transit company magnates are the only highway users in the entire Nation who are exempted from the tax provisions of this bill. When one of the gentlemen in our committee talked about the sorry financial plight of the traction companies in New York he almost wept. Last night, I happened to run across a financial magazine and looked at the financial statement of this traction company to which we are going to give part of the twenty-five to fifty million dollars. The report showed that this company made twice as much money in the first three months of this year as it had made in the first three months of last year. I do not think that this Wolfson amendment, as it might be called, should be in this highway bill. But it is there and it is going to stay there, because it is one of the things that we cannot take out of the Fallon bill. We can eliminate this

give-away to the transit companies by voting for the President's plan.

There is another proposal in this bill that should never have been in the bill. That is this bill's proposal to give away \$970 million of the tax money we take from the gasoline and tire users to the utility companies of this country. The Democrats are always saying that they are for public power and against private power. But here in their bill they give \$970 million of the taxes raised by this bill to the great utilities of the country.

Then there is also the Davis-Bacon provision of the bill. That is not a matter of controversy among the members of the committee because we voted Bacon-Davis into the bill by a vote of 28 to 4. Both Republicans and Democrats on the committee supported this provision. But in some sections of the country people are opposed to this proposal.

The big controversy in this bill is over its financial provisions. The President of the United States proposes that we finance this vast highway program by a bond issue to be paid off with the revenues which we derive from the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. The President does not feel additional taxes are necessary. During recent years we have been collecting \$875 million a year from the gasoline tax. Yet we never have spent, up to July 1 of this year, more than \$575 million of the \$875 million in any year. Here is a surplus of \$300 million we have been diverting from roads to other purposes. The President proposes to take that surplus and the increased returns from gasoline taxes that is occurring at the rate of \$50 million a year and employ all of this revenue to pay off these road bonds. The President thinks his plan is sound financially.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the greatest authority on financing in Government says the President's bonding plan is sound. The Treasury experts say it is sound. The Secretary of Commerce says it is financially sound. The Bureau of Public Roads says it is sound. Most of the governors of the United States say the President's bill is sound, workable and desirable. But the Democratic majority of the Committee on Public

Works by unanimous vote say it is unsound and they turned down the President's bonding plan and prepared a high tax plan in its place.

After the committee completed hearings, I think on June 1, there was a period of 36 days when nothing was done. No committee sessions were held. During that time there were reports that the Democrats were holding sessions of their own, with no Republicans present, trying to develop a tax plan as a substitute to the Eisenhower program.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives was quoted in the press as being opposed to a bonding plan and urging the committee to take action and get out a highway bill. Then the Democrats did come out with H. R. 7072. The taxes in H. R. 7072 were unfair, unjust and punitive. These punitive tax proposals in that original Democratic bill resulted in the Members of Congress receiving thousands of telegrams in protest to these proposed exorbitant and excessive taxes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I will yield when I have completed my statement.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman spoke about a bill I introduced. I do not think he made a fair statement. I do not believe the gentleman would want to make an unfair statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not want to make an unfair statement, but let me finish my statement, and then let the gentleman give his answer to it.

The Democrat members of the committee had meetings and finally introduced H. R. 7072. It was the only bill before the committee. It was the Democrat's high tax proposal as a substitute for the President's proposal for a bonded highway program. The telegrams poured in. We had a meeting and a subcommittee was named. Not until the subcommittee met did we begin to consider any reductions in the onerous and unjust taxes that were proposed by H. R. 7072, the Democrat bill.

Let me tell you what these taxes in that original Democrat bill were. There

was a provision that every heavy truck tire should bear a tax of 50 cents a pound. These truck tires weigh 100 pounds each. This would be a \$50 tax per tire, a 900-percent increase over the present rate of tax.

The tax on truck tubes was increased by the original Democrat bill from 9 cents a pound to 50 cents a pound, a 500-percent increase.

The tax increase on gasoline in the Democrat's bill was 1 cent a gallon, or 50 percent, and on diesel oil a competing fuel to gasoline, it was to be 4 cents, or a 200 percent increase over present rates.

On camelback retread material that wholesales at 31 cents a pound, the tax in the Democrat bill was to be \$1 a pound, 3½ times the cost of the material itself.

I noticed in press accounts that some of the Democrats have been protesting that the trucking industry and the tire people have complained about the taxes in this Democrat bill. These Democrats hinted that if the truckers and tire people did not stop complaining they were likely to destroy the highway bill. What industry in this country would not complain if it was proposed to increase their taxes 900 percent, as the Democrats proposed in the case of tires, or 3½ times the price of the commodity, as the Democrats did in the case of camelback? Would not the candy people protest if you proposed a tax of 17 cents on a 5-cent candy bar? Would not the shoe men protest if you proposed a \$35 tax on a \$10 pair of shoes? Would not the clothiers throughout this country protest if you proposed a \$175 tax on a \$50 suit of clothes? Of course Members of Congress got telegrams of protest from these people. They were justified in protesting to these proposed unfair and unjust taxes.

Finally the committee went into session with the Republicans and the Democrats attending. The committee discussed this bill very diligently and very thoroughly, and the committee now has come out with the present bill which, in my estimate, is not too bad a bill. The taxes originally proposed have been materially reduced. The \$50 tax on heavy truck tires has been reduced to \$15. The tax on tubes, that was to be 50 cents a pound, has been reduced to 15 cents. The tax on camelback used in big tires and it is reduced to 15 cents a pound instead of being \$1 a pound proposed in the original Democrat bill. The diesel fuel tax, that was 6 cents in the original Democrat bill, has now, by the action of both the Republicans and the Democrats working together, been reduced to 4 cents. It still is, I think, too high, but is not really as onerous and not nearly as bad as was first proposed.

It is a pretty fair bill, not good, but not too bad. My position on this legislation is that I will support the substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], which would adopt the President's plan, or the Republican bond plan. If, however, the President's plan is voted down, I will vote for the bill that is now before the House because safer highways are desperately needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, before yielding time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] refer to the gentleman from New York as having a crying towel when I was talking about the buses of the city of New York, and also buses throughout the United States generally. It was rather interesting to note that he said the bus system of New York City was making money. For his information, 40 percent of the buses operated within the municipal limits of New York City today have been taken over by the city of New York, because they are unable to pay their franchise tax and have been unable to make any money. Under this bill, a nonuser of the Federal highways is not supposed to be taxed. The buses in the city of New York are confined within the boundaries of the city of New York. For instance, the county which I have the honor to represent, Bronx County, has four Congressmen. The county is 4 miles square, and we have a population of 1,800,000 in that county, and not like the district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]. The buses in the city of New York never go on an interstate highway or on a secondary highway. The only roads over which those buses travel are the routes to which they are assigned from the time the buses are manufactured until the time that they go to the junkyard. Why should buses that operate within the city limits—and this applies not only to New York City but to every other city throughout the United States—have to pay taxes applicable to interstate highways, either a diesel oil tax or a gasoline tax or a rubber tax when the bus is never used on an interstate highway or a secondary road. Of course, Mr. MACK is going to prove to us that the bus companies of New York City are making money; but I would want to see that proved. You cannot vote against this bill, Mr. MACK, because you know yourself the Democrats make a very strong effort against taxing people. But I know that after this bill goes through, the President of the United States when he signs this bill, is going to say this is not the kind of bill I wanted—I did not want to tax the people—but he is going to sign it. Am I right? Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that in this important legislation we have had to have politics injected. I am very happy to be a member of the Committee on Public Works. The membership of that committee is nonpartisan with respect to legislation of this character. We are a good American committee and we leave our politics outside in the hallway. I am sorry that this incident happened on this very important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today H. R. 7474 is known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955.

The extensive hearings which were held on this legislation reminds me of when I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and we had the defense production measure under consideration. Everybody agreed that controls were necessary, but the slogan appeared to be: Please do not control our particular industry. And so it is with H. R. 7474. Everybody seems to agree that we need better roads. Everybody appears to be in favor of an interstate highway system. Most Members of the House and Senate are in favor of adequate Federal highways, but nobody seems to want to pay for them.

The Committee on Public Works held extensive hearings for 8 weeks. After listening to all of the testimony, the Fallon bill was favorably reported from the committee by a vote of 17 to 9. It is my belief that there is not a member of the committee who is satisfied with all features of the bill. We all appear to be in agreement that something must be done to improve the highway system in order to keep to a minimum the loss of human lives on the roads. We must make our highways safer for the motorist, the truck driver and pedestrians.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the sponsor of H. R. 7474 and chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, should be congratulated for making it possible to consider this important measure and afford us the opportunity to debate the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee has been fair at all times with the hearings. He gave everybody an opportunity to be heard, who expressed a desire so to do.

It is generally believed that we must build adequate roads. The Chicago American in its July 22 issue has given an excellent definition of what is meant by the word "adequate." The editorial states by "adequate" is meant a highway system constructed to handle modern traffic safely. It means straight, wide, graded, divided highways with control of access wherever this is needed. If the highways could be built by direct appropriation, that would be favored. If they could be constructed through the issuance of revenue bonds, that would be favored. If they could be established by increased taxation, that plan would be favored.

In the 83d Congress, I introduced H. R. 3637 providing that all money collected annually by the Federal Government from highway users of gasoline, fuel oil, excise taxes on tires, tubes, batteries, accessories, new cars, trucks and buses, which would yield about \$2½ billion a year should be placed in a Federal highway aid trust fund, and used for this purpose, instead of going into the general revenue fund of the Treasury and used for other purposes. If this was done we would not today be debating on how to finance a multi-billion dollar much needed Federal highway program.

The administration's bill of February 1955, called for construction of the Interstate Highway System through a revenue bond issue. Under that plan the Gov-

ernment would pay 95 percent of the cost. Under the proposed 30-year bond issue, it is estimated it would cost the taxpayers \$11 billion in interest alone.

The Fallon bill levies tax increases and will pay 90 percent of the cost. Because the House Public Works Committee, despite crushing pressure has had the courage to report it favorably after many days of intense and sometimes heated private discussions, I am in favor of the enactment of the measure for adequate Federal highways, no matter how it is financed.

When the pressure was at its heaviest, one of the committee members made this remark, "We have heard from everyone except the public." No one can speak adequately for the public except their Representatives in Congress. The public has no organized lobby or pressure groups and I am confident that we will give the public proper representation in the consideration of H. R. 7474 on the floor of the House today.

The public recognizes it will have to pay the increased taxes no matter upon what industries or articles they may be levied. The public also knows that you spend the money in building the roads and they will pay for them and nonetheless will bless you for the benefits conferred upon them in according them safe means of highway transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this measure is passed by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, it was to be expected that in providing legislation for the largest public-works program in all history that intense controversy and marked differences of opinion would develop.

The proposed expenditure of approximately \$34 billion has brought tremendous pressures on Members of Congress. As a result, our attention has been diverted from the principal objective of the legislation, namely, the critical and crucial need for a courageous highway program.

There is no longer any question that the highway systems of this country are totally inadequate to meet present and future transportation needs.

It has been said that America is a nation on wheels. Today there are 58 million automobiles on our highways. In 10 short years 90 million vehicles will crowd the roads of America. It has been clearly established by the evidence adduced before the Public Works Committee that our expanding economy will be stifled to an unbelievable degree if we do not break the traffic bottlenecks that are gradually strangling our transportation lifeline. Economic loss due to inadequate highways has reached a staggering sum, not to mention the thousands of persons that are needlessly killed each year because of these same inadequate highways.

We, therefore, come to the inescapable conclusion that an adequate and effective highway construction program is as important to the national welfare as is our defense program. In fact, highway bet-

terment is in itself a defense measure. We all know that the industrial areas will be the frontline trenches of the next war and that the only defense against atomic attack is evacuation. The evidence is overwhelming that our present highways could not possibly evacuate the cities of the United States in the time required much less move large military equipment and manpower rapidly and effectively across this country.

The time to act is now. Tomorrow may be too late. It is essential that the Congress act courageously. We must reconcile our differences—many of them petty—as to how this job is to be done.

Many of us favored the plan and method recommended by the President in the Clay report as the most effective way to handle this gigantic program. When it became apparent in committee that the method of financing the program suggested by the President was not acceptable to the majority then those of us who recognized that roads were paramount and the method of obtaining them secondary gave serious consideration to the proposals contained in the Fallon bill.

The Fallon bill and the President's program set forth in the Dondero bill are almost identical insofar as the basic and crucial parts of the legislation are concerned.

With a few exceptions only the method of financing the program is different. While the methods are different the authors of both bills have wisely and courageously provided the means of paying for this gigantic project. They are unlike the Gore bill in the Senate and the Thompson bill in the House that provide no method of financing. These latter bills are ideal for those who want to point to the fact that they voted for roads but who want to avoid the political responsibility of providing funds—who now suggest that the method of financing be deferred and turned over to the Ways and Means Committee for intensive study—who will then find it convenient at a later date to vote against such taxation programs as the Ways and Means Committee may eventually recommend.

Secondly, the Fallon and Dondero bills differ from the Gore and Thompson bills in what I consider to be the very heart of this road legislation.

For the first time in history the Fallon and Dondero bills provide for the distribution of funds on the basis of need. The money will be spent where it will do the most good—where it will do the most toward relieving traffic snarls that are gradually but surely strangling American transportation.

If we are going to follow the overwhelming and almost uncontradictable evidence adduced in the 7-week hearing before the Public Works Committee—evidence from the most competent authorities in the country—we must at least adopt the method of distributing funds as set forth in the Fallon and Dondero bills. These bills deal primarily with the interstate system. Its very name indicates that it is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned. It is on this system that we find the large volume and extreme density of traffic between

centers of population. It is on this system that we find the bottlenecks—the slowdowns, reduced to a snail's pace, just outside and in the cities and towns.

The reasons for these conditions can be understood when we realize that the interstate system, which consists of only 37,600 miles, represents approximately 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country. This 1 percent, however, carries one-seventh of all the traffic. It means, therefore, that the density of traffic on the interstate system is 14 times the average density on all other highways.

These conditions have resulted in tremendously increased automobile operating costs, such as gasoline and oil consumption waste, brake and tire wear, and, above all, an unbelievable man-hour loss. The loss to the trucking industry, which is eventually passed on to the consumer, is incalculable.

The rebuilding of the interstate system to the standards required will save 1 cent a mile in operating costs for passenger cars.

The trucking industry will save 4 cents a mile in operating costs.

All this will result in a total savings to highway users and our economy of \$1,475,000,000 per year.

The evidence is conclusive that it is on the interstate system where we are having a disproportionate number of accidents and loss of life. The rebuilding of the interstate system will result in a reduction of monetary losses from accidents alone amounting to \$725 million per year. The total savings, therefore, will reach the staggering sum \$2,100,000,000 a year. These savings alone will offset much of the cost of the program.

Furthermore, one of the principal advocates for the development of the interstate system is the Department of Defense. The Defense Department, like all of us, has no problem with its equipment reaching the main arteries of traffic from its installations. It points out that its difficulty, like yours and mine, begins when it attempts to transport large military equipment and personnel across the country on the interstate system. The Department of Defense, without reservation, recommends that the interstate system be developed as proposed by the administration and that it be given priority.

The testimony shows that the primary, secondary, and farm-to-market roads are generally capable of adequately doing the job that is demanded of them today.

I drive between Cincinnati and Washington quite often over the interstate system. In view of my service on the Subcommittee on Roads, I have made careful observation of conditions. Time and time again I have driven in a long line of traffic, frequently crawling up steep grades with other vehicles behind big trucks. While impatiently waiting to move ahead more quickly, I have glanced down the intersecting secondary roads. Invariably they have been in good condition, with little or no traffic on them. Usually vehicles, if any, on these intersecting thoroughfares would be stopped at the intersection waiting to enter the crowded arterial highway. I

am certain each of you has had similar experiences. There are 1 million miles of such secondary roads in this country that carry only from 1 to 100 cars a day.

I am not saying these secondary roads are perfect—that they do not need improvement and that we should not spend any money on them. All I am trying to do is to point out the relative needs.

Last year this Congress almost doubled the amount of Federal funds allocated for these other systems. The fact is that most of this additional money has yet not been used for improvement of these roads. Some States are going to have difficulty in matching the new funds provided for in the 1954 act.

If the interstate system is improved as recommended by the President all other roads will have made available further additional funds in the nature of a hidden windfall. Because of the heavy demands on the interstate system, States today are spending a large part of their own highway funds on the rebuilding and maintenance of the interstate system within their respective States. If the Federal Government takes over the cost of rebuilding these interstate roads the States then will be able to use the money they are now spending on the interstate system on their secondary highways. These roads are primarily the States responsibility anyhow.

Now, in spite of what has been shown about relative needs, it is now proposed by some to dump additional millions on these roads.

Thirty States have said they will not be able to match these additional amounts. Why do some then in the face of these facts and all of the evidence to the contrary and against the recommendations of 97 percent of the witnesses who appeared before our committee, insist on giving these additional Federal funds for the secondary systems. Why do some advocate this when the available money is limited—when this money could be used so much more profitably if it were used where it is actually needed.

A long list of highway experts and responsible organizations, headed by the Association of State Highway officials, proved by cogent evidence that the solution to our critical highway deficiencies was the immediate and uniform, and note I say uniform, rebuilding of our interstate system under modern scientific highway engineering standards in every State in the Union. The cost of doing this job will vary from State to State depending on the number of miles of the interstate system within the State—topography, land acquisition costs, width of highways, utility relocation costs, number of grade separations, and interchanges.

Both the Fallon and Dondero bills will give America the highway system she so badly needs in the shortest possible time. Because the need is critical this House must do everything possible to reconcile our differences over the method of financing the program. I realize this is a difficult assignment, particularly in view of the tremendous pressures that have been exerted on us by those who have special interests at stake.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Have not the highway users provided millions of dollars over the past 20 years for general purposes?

Mr. SCHERER. I still say that the Thompson bill provides no financing.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. It certainly does.

Mr. SCHERER. As I say, these latter bills are ideal for those who want to point to the fact that they voted for roads but who want to avoid the political responsibility of providing the funds.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, so far the equation has been between two propositions. One group of advocates is for H. R. 7474 and the other is for the so-called Clay proposal. There are members of the committee who think that there is still a better approach to the solution of the highway problem than that contained in either one of those two proposals heretofore discussed.

I want to call the attention of the Members to the minority report commencing at page 36 of the committee report. I hope the Members will read the dissenting views, because it is impossible for us at this time to go into every section of the bill for the purpose of making a comparative analysis.

Let us review briefly the most recent history of the Highway Act. The most important category of roads to be dealt with in any of the three proposals is the interstate system of roads. Under the Highway Act of 1946, it provides that there would be a system of highways known as the interstate highway system or defense highways. It comprises 40,000 miles out of a total of 720,000 miles which make up the Federal road system that is eligible for Federal assistance. Up to the present moment there has been designated on the interstate system 37,600 miles. The balance of the mileage has yet to be designated.

In the 1952 act we authorized for appropriation the first money items for the interstate system. We provided \$25 million. In the fiscal year that has just expired there was expended or contracted for expenditure \$25 million for the 40,000 miles of road. This year there will be expended or authorized for expenditure under contract with the State highway departments \$175 million on a matching basis of 60-40. All other categories of roads are on a 50-50 basis.

In the same period the secondary roads in 1955 got \$165 million. In 1956, this year, they will get \$210 million.

The primary or principal arterial roads, exclusive of the interstate system, got \$247 million in the calendar year 1955 and \$315 million for the fiscal year 1956.

The urban roads got \$137 million for 1955 and \$175 million for the fiscal year 1956.

Now let us see the differences between the proposals now pending before the committee. Section 1 of H. R. 7474 provides that the interstate system will obtain for the first year approximately

\$1.2 billions. The amounts made available in 1956 on the matching basis of the so-called ABC roads will be \$725 million with an increase of \$25 million annually until it reaches \$1 billion. That is not provided for in the so-called Clay bill. The Clay bill freezes the amounts of money at the figure of the 1954 act. The bond would be issued for a 30-year period, with an accelerated amount for the interstate system. There would be no increases in the categories that are frozen.

In addition we have the Thompson bill, H. R. 7542, which provides for a 10-year program which provides for a billion dollars a year for the interstate system. We will commence the fiscal year 1957 with \$725 million for the ABC roads and increase it \$25 million a year until in 10 years it reaches the \$1 billion.

The reason for that is that we acknowledge there is a tremendous road problem in our country. We are increasing the number of vehicles on our highways by approximately 3 billion a year, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out. If we are going to take a uniform approach to the road program, it means that we cannot undertake the program and neglect other categories of roads. The interstate system carries only 14 percent or one-seventh of the total vehicular traffic now on our highways. Yet the adoption of either the Clay proposal or H. R. 7474 would mean that the interstate system would get a far disproportionate amount of money than would be obtained under a uniform approach such as proposed in the Thompson bill.

In section 3 of the Dondero bill, which is the Clay proposal, and the Fallon bill, which is H. R. 7474, there is a 20-percent exchange. We have heard a great deal of comment that the States could take this 20 percent which accrues under all categories of roads and transfer it to suit their needs. We all know that the State of Alabama or the State of New York or State of California, as the case might be, is not going to take the 90-10 money, that is, 90-percent Federal Government and 10-percent State government money and put it on the secondary or primary roads whereby they will be required to put up 50 percent of the total cost of the project. The 20-percent figure will make no great change in the ABC systems of roads nor will the State be a greater beneficiary or recipient of Federal assistance from the amounts made available to the interstate systems of roads.

Section 4 is the tax provision. Of course, it is the most controversial section of the bill. The so-called Clay plan, they say, does not increase the taxes, and the gentleman from Ohio made a great plea for honesty and forthrightness in dealing with this problem of taxes. If it is a forthright proposition that he insists upon, then let him oppose the so-called Clay bill where there is not one red penny to be collected in taxes, but which takes the money from the General Treasury of the United States where all the taxable sources of revenues is now deposited and turns it over to the corporation to pay that amount which naturally increases the deficit of the Federal

Treasury. How can you spend over \$2 billion a year without jeopardizing the fiscal situation of the Federal Government when you increase the debt by a minimum of \$24 billion in 10 years? If he wants to avoid that, then let him vote against the Clay plan. Under the Thompson proposal, there is the recognition that on this enormous program of road construction where we, for the first time, are providing an enormous amount of money in the sum of \$1 billion for the construction of the interstate system that there is no great and imperative need for increased taxation. In the first place, these taxes expire on March 1, 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FALLON. I am sorry, but the time has all been allocated as fairly as I could divide the time between the members of the committee. I can give the gentleman an extra minute.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means will have an opportunity next March to sit down and in an orderly fashion review the fiscal situation in relation to the \$12.4 billion which is proposed in taxes under the Fallon bill. Why was it necessary for us to have to consider for the first time a revenue measure for raising money for a highway program? Further, we had 12 hours to consider the question of a \$12.4 billion tax program. I hope that the provision of H. R. 7474 will be voted down, and that the so-called Clay plan will be rejected. I hope we will adopt a bill that will increase the amount for roads and give the Congress an opportunity to review this whole situation in a normal fashion, as we have done heretofore.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering one of the largest projects ever dreamed of, and more than likely the biggest project the world will ever attempt. As I recall, this project will amount to approximately 90 times the cost of the Panama Canal, all to be built within a period of about 12 years.

As a member of the Public Works Committee that for almost 2 months considered the administration bill which was the result of an extensive investigation by the Clay Commission, I feel that the theory in general is sound and that the highway program as recommended could be built without the imposition of any new or additional taxes. The opposition to the payment of interest during the reasonable life of this project in my opinion is very much of a bug-a-boo. Money in the taxpayers pocket from an interest standpoint offsets the interest charge that would accrue against the obligation for the construction of the highway. However, this bill was voted down in committee and as the Gore bill had passed the Senate, we are called to work out a compromise bill.

The original bill as submitted carried tax provisions that would have in many respects crippled the highway users and in my opinion, was very unfair. We were able to reduce the proposed taxes

by amending H. R. 7474 to a point where at least the highway users could operate without the confiscation of the businesses and industries. H. R. 7474 is not a compromise measure but an entirely different approach to the cost for construction of highways. I voted to report this bill after we had greatly reduced the proposed taxes because I realize the great need for an adequate highway system. We cannot continue the terrific traffic casualties that amount to some 36,000 a year and the maiming of more than a million each year. The cost of our inadequate highways is estimated in loss of wages, medical expenses, property damage and cost of overhead insurance, at about \$4,350,000,000 each year.

With improvements contemplated under this act, it is estimated that at least 4,000 lives will be saved each year because of safer highways, and millions of dollars in property losses. With the Federal Government assuming 90 percent of the cost of the national interstate system, the States with the amount of Federal appropriation money plus their own highway income, will be able to bring the highway system of our country up to a high standard of improvement within the 10-year program.

The Dondero bill H. R. 7494 I understand, will be offered as a substitute to H. R. 7474. If this substitute is approved I shall endeavor to amend the same by a reduced tax as contained in the present bill by the following amounts which will truly be a compromise bill: Reduce the gasoline tax from 1 cent to a half cent, reduce diesel fuel from 2 cents to 1 cent, reduce the tax on small truck tires from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound, reduce the tax on large sized tires from 10 cents to 5 cents, reduce the tax on large tubes from 6 cents to 4 cents per pound, reduce the tax on camelback from 15 cents to 7½ cents per pound but allow the 2 percent manufacturer's tax to remain the same as this would merely bring the truck tax on a par with the tax now imposed on private pleasure cars. These taxes though reduced would produce new income of about \$7 billion and added to the tax now being collected, should retire the entire obligation in a period of less than 20 years. This should be a practical and reasonable compromise between the two theories set forth for the financing of this program.

I trust that when the opportunity presents itself that I may secure the support of the membership of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, when I became a Member of the Congress in 1949, I requested appointment to the Public Works Committee. My reason for doing so was the fact that I had just completed 10 years of service in the Kansas State Highway Department in an executive capacity. During that period of time, I had attended numerous national conferences of State highway officials, and had attended numerous conferences of the States making up the Mississippi Valley group.

At these meetings I became thoroughly familiar with the highway problem of the United States—not only as it applied to rural and urban areas, but the tremendous deficiencies that exist in our great cities.

I thought, from my knowledge and background, I might be able to contribute something to the Public Works Committee, especially as it related to our national highway program.

During the first Congress, in 1950, I was also shocked and surprised to find that the Bureau of the Budget was only proposing a \$400 million appropriation to the States.

The record showed that the gasoline tax alone was producing, in national revenue, almost twice that amount of money. I asked the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget how they justified their figure on the basis of our tremendous highway needs, and how they could reconcile less than 50 percent of the highway users tax going back to highways for construction to benefit the traveling public. They could not and did not try to justify their figure.

The Public Works Committee, in its wisdom, upon my motion, decided to increase this amount \$100 million a year for construction purposes. We members of the Public Works Committee were still not satisfied that this was an adequate program, so under the leadership of Congressman HARRY MCGREGOR, who became chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee in 1952, your committee held exhaustive hearings on highway needs and what should and must be done to bring our highway program to a more nearly adequate system.

I want to assure you that these hearings were held entirely on a bipartisan and nonpolitical basis as our committee has always operated on this basis up to the present time. After these hearings, the Public Works Committee passed a greatly expanded highway program providing for \$900 million in Federal aid.

Upon the basis of our study and what highway builders everywhere knew, and the traveling public were finding out to their sorrow, the Congress of the United States had been backing an entirely inadequate highway system. We had not even remotely tried to keep up with the tremendous needs in this field.

It was with this background and the special knowledge of our problem that the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, appointed what has become known as the Clay Committee, to make recommendations to him as to how we could satisfactorily meet our tremendous transportation problem.

This was a bipartisan committee. They consulted with the National Association of State Highway Officials, all the Governors of the United States, all of the State highway departments, the organization of the Council of Mayors of the United States, and other interested groups.

After an exhaustive 3-month study, the Clay Committee made its report to the President, with certain specific recommendations as to how it would be feasible to implement this large highway-building program.

Congressman BUCKLEY, of New York, Congressman DONDERO, of Michigan, and myself, all introduced a highway measure intending to implement the Clay Committee recommendations, which would give us an adequate national highway defense system in a period of 10 years.

The Public Works Committee started its hearings the middle of April on the provisions written into this bill. The hearings lasted until June 1 and comprised 1,093 pages of testimony from all segments of our economy, 90 percent of whom endorsed the provisions contained in this proposed law.

At this point, I would like to introduce in the RECORD testimony given by Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut, who appeared before our committee at the time of the governors' conference in Washington, and the evidence he gave was after the Senate had reported out the Gore bill. Governor Ribicoff's testimony is in line with the opinions expressed by a vast majority of the governors, as well as the mayors of the cities in the United States:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MAY 4, 1955

GOVERNOR RIBICOFF. All I want to say is, it is very good to get back and see so many of my former colleagues. As my eye goes around the hall, there are very few who did not serve with me in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

Of course, when you sit on the executive side, the problems look a little different than when you are on the legislative side.

But I do want to say I have been designated by the six New England governors to present the New England point of view. As you know, the New England States have 3 Democratic and 3 Republican governors. I come before you talking for Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine.

All of us have studied this problem and we have come to a unanimous agreement that we prefer the Clay proposal to the Gore plan. As a matter of fact, we find that we would have great difficulty in matching the funds required by the Gore plan. We do find that we will not have any difficulty in supplying the matching funds under the Clay proposal. * * *

In answer to some of the questions you asked, we in New England feel that there is not anything wrong in bonding for capital improvements. You used the phrases "pay-as-you-go" or "pay later." I would like to substitute the phrases "pay-as-you-use" or "pay-as-you-ride." Basically these roads are going to be built for people to use during the next 30 years or more. Under those circumstances I do not think it is too onerous to expect the people who are actually using the roads to pay for those roads as they were using them, because it is the same thing in the most simple and elemental sense as a young man who is getting married and who wants to buy a house. I suppose he could save \$500 a year for 25 or 30 years and then when he is an old man, get a house. Or, he can go down to the bank and get a mortgage on the house and enjoy it for the next 25 years or 30 years, and pay the interest charges, and capital expenditures off while he is using that home himself and his family.

It is my hope that this committee will report out a bill. As a governor, and listening to the governor's conference in Washington these last few days, it is very obvious that the highway needs in every State are as important as any other issue facing our

people. I know and you know, whether it is the city of Washington, or Detroit, or Hartford, Conn., or wherever you come from, we have traffic snarls and traffic tangles that are really freezing the mobility of our Nation. With the amount of automobiles being used, if we do not solve the highway needs you are setting this Nation into economic paralysis. * * *

The six New England governors definitely feel that the Gore bill is not a good bill, and we do believe that the Clay program is a good program.

I respectfully hope that you gentlemen in considering this legislation will take these factors into account.

Mr. Chairman, up until June 1, the Public Works Committee had been practically free of partisan politics, and it was for this reason I have been proud to be a member of this committee. However, on that date, for some reason, our hearings on the President's proposal were stopped. The Democrat members of our committee met in private sessions, and a few weeks later, we were presented with the Fallon bill.

The Public Works Committee then proceeded to vote to substitute the Fallon bill for the President's bill. This was done with all the Democrat committee members voting for this substitution.

Of course, our committee was thrown into a turmoil. In order to prevent not having highway legislation this year, the committee voted to authorize the chairman and the ranking minority member to appoint a roads subcommittee of 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans to see if we could work out some compromise in the taxing provisions of the Fallon bill which would be more acceptable to the general public, and to see if we could once again restore the bipartisan action that has always prevailed in our Public Works Committee.

After numerous meetings by this roads subcommittee in which they scaled down the taxing provisions of the Fallon bill, the result of their action was presented to the full committee for its consideration. After further amending the Fallon proposal, we have the bill that is before us today for your consideration.

My State of Kansas is not particularly concerned or involved in this legislation because, out of our 128,000 miles of highway, 10,000 miles of which are on our Federal and State system, and 35,000 miles of which are on our farm-to-market system, we only have a little over 600 miles involved in the measure we are considering today for the inter-regional highway system.

If I were to look at this legislation purely from a congressional viewpoint, as it affects my district, or even as it affects my State, I would adopt the provincial attitude and be against all of these provisions. But with the knowledge I have, I realize the tremendous need for some type of an expanded highway program. I do not want to see us get bogged down in trying to promote the common good, in purely partisan politics.

It is my intention to support the amendment, which will be offered by Congressman DONDERO, to substitute the administration's measure in preference to the Democratic bill. I am doing this with the idea in mind that it will get the job done quicker and will cause less

dislocation in our financial and taxing structure.

If this substitute is adopted by the Congress, and those people who want to substitute the taxing provision, and who believe we should more or less pay for this program as we go, they, of course, can push their taxing provisions in the next session of Congress.

It has occurred to me that we should, in fairness, try to raise more money for this program, and above all, we should see that if it is raised, it applies to our highway systems throughout the United States.

I believe the Ways and Means Committee should make an exhaustive study, starting in January, with the idea in mind of raising more revenue for highway purposes and equalizing inequalities they now have in existing law. For instance, they now levy tax on gasoline at the source and the average farmer throughout the United States, who burns tractor gasoline, is forced to contribute to this fund without any exemption or refund, while his more fortunate neighbor, who is operating on a much larger scale and can afford the investment in a diesel tractor, does not pay any tax for fuel consumed off the highway.

This procedure over a period of years has penalized the small farmer and given special privilege to the large operator with more high-priced equipment.

I think we should pass the President's proposal, based on the studies begun in past years, and on the Clay Committee Report, which was worked out with the governors, mayors, and State highway department officials of the United States.

If we substitute this measure for the Fallon bill, then I think the Ways and Means Committee should make adequate provisions in the coming year to liquidate this program as fast as they find it to be reasonable and practical.

I urge that you support the Dondero substitute.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to give a little history of the proposed bill known as the Clay plan. It bears the name of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and former chairman of that committee.

First, however, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Public Roads, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. During the many long weeks of hearings he met with some very trying situations but through all of them kept his equilibrium and always came up with a smile. He treated every member of the committee fairly and every person who appeared before that committee received a full hearing.

This is the first time in my legislative experience, both as a member of the New York State Legislature and as a Member of the House, when a bill came before a committee with as comprehensive a report as this, submitted by the committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, a non-partisan committee, made up of people who were experts in various fields of ac-

tivity. After many months of hearings, the Dondero bill was written, formulating the plan, which has been approved by the President of the United States.

The Committee on Public Roads held hearings for 7 long weeks, beginning on April 18 and running well into June. They appear in this volume of 1,100 pages of testimony. I can say without fear of contradiction that of the people appearing before the committee better than 95 percent spoke in favor of the Clay plan, which is the Dondero bill featuring the bond plan. Over 95 percent testified in favor of that plan. I can remember hardly anyone who testified against it. The governors of the various States appearing before the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, were heartily in favor of this plan of financing. Every one spoke in favor also of an interstate system throughout the entire United States, not only because of the economic benefits but for national-defense requirements.

Mr. Chairman, after the hearings were concluded we had silence for several weeks. Then we heard—I am speaking about myself and the Republican members—that the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee were holding private caucuses and would come up with a new bill. Several weeks later, we were apprised of a bill encompassing the various provisions that is now known as the Fallon bill. Before hearings were set on the Fallon bill we received hundreds and hundreds of telegrams and protests on its provisions.

Only then were hearings set on the tax provisions. Twelve hours of hearings were provided, and even in those hearings, I think the record will show, that there was a great deal of testimony in opposition to the taxing provisions.

Now, very briefly the picture is simply this: The Clay committee convinced me that the Dondero bill was a good bill and that the financing provisions were completely sound and workable. Seven weeks of testimony by various governors, experts, road people, and other witnesses confirmed that it was in the best interest of the people.

The question will be brought up here about \$11.5 billion in interest to provide for the bonds under the Clay plan. Well, none of us like to pay interest. But let me call your attention to the fact that since 1945 this Congress has voted \$65 billion in foreign aid, every dollar of which is deficit financing which means borrowed money and the taxpayers of this country are paying \$1.6 billion a year in interest in order to provide for foreign aid. That makes \$16 billion in interest that we will pay on that deficit financing for foreign aid in a 10-year period.

So, what is wrong with providing a plan for financing by a bond issue to give the American people good highways? I see nothing wrong in it. Our whole economy is based upon financing on installment buying. That is how this highway system can be built. I say that the Dondero bill is a good bill, and the bonding provisions are good, and I hope it prevails.

There is one thing I would like to say in closing. The Davis-Bacon provisions

are not in the Dondero bill, I shall support that as an amendment, to be offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the general history of this highway legislation, I, too, want to join in the tributes that have been paid to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], in regard to the work that he has done on this bill. I also want to pay tribute to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Through the cooperation of these two leaders of the committee and various other members, we achieved a notable victory in that committee, one that has been obscured in this fight about the taxing provisions. The great victory that was achieved was the resounding defeat of this so-called Clay plan or, let me be more specific, the Eisenhower plan, which was turned down by the committee by a good, substantial vote.

FINANCIAL HOCUS-FOCUS

The Eisenhower plan was rejected in the committee for a number of reasons. I think the most obvious reason and the most compelling reason that motivated the people who voted against the Eisenhower plan was the question of the financial ledgerdomain involved in that plan. It was a matter of simple honesty as opposed to this question of whether you are going to try to cover up and conceal an addition to the national debt.

The gentleman from New York who just preceded me has made it very plain that the Eisenhower plan would be, as he says, an addition to the national debt. Of course, it would be written out in such a manner that it would not be added to the debt limit that would cost the taxpayers an extra \$2 billion. But, that would not amount to much if it saved us from adding to the debt limit. What is \$2 billion if we can avoid asking for a debt-limit increase? It is a cheap matter to put up \$2 billion to stop from adding to the debt limit. In fact, we have spent more than that, and we will, to avoid this increase in the debt limit.

FREEZE ON OTHER PLANS

In addition to that, the Eisenhower plan would provide for a 30-year freeze of all of the normal Federal aid assistance. The normal primary and secondary roads assistance that we have been carrying on, that we have expanded this year for the first time at a good margin will be frozen at the present level. That is envisioned in order to pay for the Eisenhower bonds and to pay for this \$11 or \$12 billion in interest that would be required under that proposal.

There is some question as to actually how much the interest would be. We have estimates in regard to this interest that would make it perhaps higher than was suggested here.

MR. CAMPBELL'S OPPOSITION

A lot of statements have been made about the witnesses who appeared before our committee. Nobody on my left side

has mentioned that very outstanding Republican appointed by the President of the United States to be Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, who appeared before our committee and very strongly opposed the Clay plan and the method of financing as the worst type of unsound financial legislation.

The testimony of Mr. Campbell was one of the important factors in the decision of some 19 members of the committee to reject the Clay plan. As I mentioned earlier, the great victory that was achieved in our committee was the rejection of the Clay plan, which is nothing more than financial legerdomain to get up a pump-priming system that will help give us some economic activity, without the cost having to be reflected in the national debt as we normally consider it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true that in the committee, all the way through, the gentleman was opposed to any highway system?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is completely untrue, and anybody who says that, I shall repeat it to him in stronger language.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. No; I do not want to dwell upon that point further. I made it very clear in the committee that if the financial plans proposed were in accordance with correct user taxes I would support such a plan. Unfortunately, the majority of the committee did not support my ideas.

TAX NOTES

While we are talking about that, I would like to pay my respects to some of my good Republican colleagues who have been complaining about the taxes in this bill, yet, when the issue came up in regard to taxes in the committee they voted for every one of them.

I would like to pay my respect to those people on the Republican side who complained about limited hearings, when the vast majority of the Republican members of the committee voted to limit those hearings.

There are a great many things wrong with this bill, as has been pointed out. We voted out \$12 billion of taxes in 12 hours of hearings, or about a billion dollars per hour of hearings.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. So far as the gentleman was concerned, the great victory in the committee was the defeat of the Clay proposal. Having won that victory, is the gentleman now willing to go along with the Fallon bill or is the gentleman going to vote for the Thompson bill, which is no bill at all?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yielded for a question, not for a speech on the Thompson bill. I shall vote for the Thompson bill, which is certainly in keeping with a conservative attitude toward a financing program. If the gentleman on my left were concerned

about the economic policy of our country, were really concerned about how we should proceed under this program, they should consider the Thompson bill, which is a moderate bill, to start with, and which can be expanded in the future to meet any type of goal desired if economic conditions so indicate and if the workings under the bill should so indicate in the future.

PUMP PRIMING

I have heard some rumors from the left side of the aisle to the effect that one of the reasons for promoting this bill—it has not been brought out in debate, but several of them mentioned it to me privately—that this is a good bill to stir up economic activity in this country and keep things prosperous and make things all right in that way. I agree that perhaps it is along that line, but I have some question about how our overall economy would be affected by this bill.

Certainly the Fallon bill, which is before us, is much to be preferred to the Clay plan. But actually, the most conservative and the soundest approach that could be made to this legislation is the Thompson bill. We could accelerate the program as provided under the Thompson bill, consistent with the manner in which we can provide proper taxes upon the actual users of the interstate highway system, instead of putting them upon the general public, because 86 percent of the general public will not use this interstate highway system.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wonder if the gentleman, in stating his objections to the Clay plan has brought out the fact—

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It actually was the Eisenhower plan.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The Eisenhower plan, if the gentleman prefers to call it that—has brought out the fact that the testimony developed the fact that the roads would probably wear out in about 20 years, and that you would still be paying for another 10 years for roads that had already worn out?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I have not referred to that, but others have. We would be having second and third mortgages on these roads under the Eisenhower plan. At the same time the normal primary and secondary systems would be frozen with no additional aid.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. As a matter of fact, did not the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, testify if that came about certain taxes would have to be imposed?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It was borne out in his testimony to the committee that we would either have to have new taxes at that time or new bonds.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. Was there anybody in authority who said these highways would be worn out in 20 years? As I understand it, they were remarks made by individuals. But the rights-of-way will not deteriorate, the foundations are

not going to deteriorate, and the bridges will not deteriorate in that time.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The rights-of-way will not deteriorate, but I should point out the situation in a lot of the States right now, that the rights-of-way will become obsolete in connection with the construction of the new interstate system that we expect to authorize, I am told that in a lot of the States some of the present interstate system of rights-of-way will have to be abandoned because they are not large enough and it would be too expensive to widen them. That will be the situation when the traffic count gets higher at the end of this period.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire to see an adequate and constructive road program projected. I definitely feel that the program recommended by President Eisenhower and embodied in the measures introduced sometime ago by Congressman BUCKLEY, of New York, chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, and by Congressman DONDERO, of Michigan, who is the ranking Republican member of the Public Works Committee. Both of these bills provided for the establishment of a Federal Highway Corporation and vested it with the authority to issue bonds to finance the program. Said bonds and the interest on them to be paid by the residue of the 2-cent gasoline and the 2-cent diesel oil tax after financing the Federal-aid program now in effect and which the Federal Government participates in to the extent of approximately \$800 million, all on a 50-50 participation basis.

The testimony before the Public Works Committee was that there is a grave need for an expanded Federal-highway program, particularly as it affects our interstate system. All of the bills proposed to date emphasize a greatly expanded interstate highway program with the matching funds changed from the 50-50 formula to a 90-10 formula, with the Federal Government supplying 90 percent. I favor a bond issue to finance this expanded highway program. Secretary Humphrey, appearing before the committee, stated that he would have no difficulty selling the bonds. I shall support the Dondero substitute when it is proposed.

The need is urgent for new and improved highways; however, this is not a valid argument for adopting a revenue provision which is not only harsh, but, in my opinion, is discriminatory.

I am opposed to the revenue section of this bill for two reasons: First, that it places a further tax burden upon an already overtaxed product, gasoline; and, second, that it hits a class of taxpayers in my State who are now straining under the burden of a \$60 million worth of State tax increase recently imposed by the Wisconsin Legislature.

I do not know how it has been with the rest of you, but I for one have been literally deluged with telegrams and other communications from the people back home asking me to spare them the added burden of this proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

In Wisconsin the State gasoline tax was raised this year from a rate of 4 cents a gallon to 6 cents—a 50-percent increase—costing the highway users of my State an additional \$22 million a year. Accordingly, this proposed 50-percent increase in the Federal tax rate would add still another \$11 million to their gas-tax burden.

Added to this is the fact that the Wisconsin Legislature this year found it necessary to increase some of the general State taxes which fall heavily upon car owners and other citizens alike. Among these was a \$29 million increase in the surtax on individual incomes, and a \$7 million increase in the cigarette tax. Such is the picture of the present tax situation in my own State, and probably in many other States as well.

With less than 2 million taxpayers in the State of Wisconsin, that \$60 million increase in State revenue spells for the average citizen an added tax bill of \$30 to \$35 a year.

With 1.3 million motor vehicles registered in Wisconsin, the \$22 million increase in the State gas tax means an added \$17 a year for the average car owner to pay in that 1 item—and if we now add yet another cent to the Federal tax rate, he will be paying, on an average, more than \$76 a year in gasoline taxes alone—half again as much as the \$51 he paid last year.

This brings me to my other point—that gasoline is a commodity which is already being taxed at a staggeringly high rate when compared with all the other automotive products and supplies.

The prevailing price of regular gasoline in Wisconsin is now a little less than 23 cents a gallon, but when you add to that the 6 cents of State tax plus the proposed 3-cent Federal tax, you have a levy amounting to 40 percent of the selling price.

That, I submit, is exactly four times as much tax as we now pay on luxuries—and I am just wondering today how many people back home actually consider their cars to be such superluxuries as to warrant the fancy schedule of taxes now being fashioned for them to pay.

Many of the people I talked to seem to think that this Federal highway program, tied in as it is with national defense, should be financed in large measure out of general revenues and should not be paid for just by those people who happen to own automobiles and trucks.

Why, they ask, should the car owner, in the face of all the special taxes he now pays to support ordinary highway programs, be saddled with this extraordinary item of national defense spending?

That is a tough question to answer—and if the answer of this Congress is to be that the full weight shall be placed on highway users, then I say that the least we can do is turn our sights toward some of the other automotive taxes—the ones which are not duplicated at State level and which, therefore, now carry a far lower tax rate.

The present 10-percent Federal excise on new cars now produces about \$1 billion a year, while the 8-percent tax on trucks, trailers, and buses yields another

\$200 million or more. If we were to increase those rates—not to the 40-percent level at which gasoline is now taxed—but merely to a conservative 15-percent rate, we would gain an additional \$675 million a year in revenue. That is \$175 million more than the \$500 million the proposed increase in the Federal gas tax is calculated to produce.

But looking into this a little further, just as a matter of interest, we might also apply that 15-percent rate to the item of auto parts and accessories, which are now taxed at 8 percent. There we would gain \$179 million a year.

And as for tires and tubes, we have heard a good bit of testimony on that point. The present tire tax, though stated in terms of cents per pound, figures out, I believe, to about 6 percent of the price. By boosting that tax rate to the equivalent of a 15-percent levy, we would get another \$200 million or more.

Lubricating oil is another item to be considered, but in checking into that I find that the present Federal tax of 6 cents a gallon already amounts to something between 37 and 50 percent of the manufacturer's price, so there is no need to talk of raising that one. It is already 2 or 3 times as high as our hypothetical 15-percent level.

So now let us recapitulate to see, just as a matter of curiosity, what revenue gains we would achieve by applying a 15-percent rate or its equivalent to all those Federal automotive taxes which are not duplicated at State level.

A 15-percent tax on new automobiles would add \$500 million a year.

A similar rate on trucks, trailers, and buses would add \$175 million a year.

A 15-percent tax on parts and accessories would add \$179 million a year.

The equivalent of a 15-percent tax on tires and inner tubes would add about \$200 million or more.

All of these add up to something over \$1 billion a year in increased revenues—and all this without increasing any of those individual taxes to anything higher than 15 percent, which is but a fraction of the present level of taxation on gasoline.

But bear in mind that I am not saying that this is what we should do. As I said before, I feel that the people of my State—and especially those who own automobiles—are already paying full and plenty in special taxes levied for highway purposes. They should not be called upon to finance this phase of national defense single-handed.

My point is this: that with combined taxes on gasoline in Wisconsin and most other States now amounting to 35 percent of the price, and going up to 40 percent if we impose this Federal increase.

And with so many States now faced with the necessity of further raising their State gas tax rates as the only apparent means of financing their own part of the vast highway program blueprint for them by the Federal Government.

Where is the wisdom of a proposal that puts the Federal Government in the position of further invading this particular field of taxation which is the mainstay source of State highway reve-

nue and a field in which the States themselves hold a prior claim?

Why should the tax on gasoline constantly go up and up—to 40, 50, and perhaps some day to 100 percent of the retail price, while all these other automotive excises—which are not duplicated at State level—must be held so sacredly to a conservative level of 10 percent or less?

The same argument applies with equal force to the increase in the Federal tax on diesel fuel oil. I believe that the proposed differential between gasoline and diesel fuel is not justified. The economy of operating a diesel engine is being narrowed each year by improvements in gasoline engine design and development. Any differential presupposes a fixed and constant fuel consumption differential between the gasoline and diesel engine. These assumptions are not valid.

I am likewise opposed to the additional taxes on tires and tubes imposed in section 4 of the most recent Fallon bill. I am not sure that these taxes will not do harm to a great industry. I say this because I believe that the Public Works Committee of the House is not in any position to pass on taxation matters which have such an impact on our present economy as do the taxes imposed in section 4 of H. R. 7474. In discussing the taxation features in our committee at all times there was considerable confusion due to the fact that the committee had neither the experience nor the facilities to act wisely on these very intricate and related activities. Probably the most absurd situation was in Mr. FALLON's first bill, H. R. 7072. There was a tax imposition of 20 cents a pound on recapped or retreaded tires which would make the cost of the retreaded tire more than the cost of a new tire and would put in the neighborhood of 10,000 firms now recapping tires out of business. Likewise the other revenue features of the first Fallon bill were ridiculously high; they have now been toned down and somewhat corrected, I believe, for the prime purpose of obtaining support in this House. These tax features of the highway bill should have been gone over by the Ways and Means Committee so that we would have an experienced and capable analysis of the taxes and of the repercussions it was reasonable to expect the taxes would have upon our present economy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I certainly think the gentleman is making a wonderful statement and I know he has worked hard on this matter. We are both deeply interested in problems that face certain municipalities and I am sure he will recall that while the highway legislation was being considered by the Public Works Committee, the representatives of the city of Milwaukee, and of the cities of La Crosse and Madison, called to our attention a problem that has arisen in conjunction with the eligibility of certain urban routes for Federal assistance.

The representatives of these cities suggested that the 1955 Highway Act include a provision which would make certain urban routes, which do not con-

stitute direct extensions of the primary or secondary systems, eligible for Federal assistance.

Will the gentleman advise me whether the bill before us contains a provision which would carry into effect the recommendations made by the above-mentioned cities?

Mr. WITHROW. Indeed I was very much interested in regard to that. Mr. DuPont, President Eisenhower's special assistant, who was assigned to the road conference told us under interrogation that section 3 of H. R. 7474 would take care of that because it would permit of the transfer of 20 percent of funds if approved by State highway authorities.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In other words, the bill before us will make Federal assistance available for certain lateral, feeder, distributor, circumferential, and civil defense evacuation routes which may be required to furnish maximum utility of the various Federal-aid systems within or adjacent to urban areas.

Mr. WITHROW. We were assured by Mr. DuPont that it would.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, there has been a suggestion or two here this afternoon that the taxing provisions of this bill constitute its most controversial feature. I do not dissent from that conclusion. In fact, the taxing provisions are the all-important ones to Alaska. Indeed, they are the only ones which apply. Here is a situation where taxes are being imposed without any corresponding benefits, or any benefits at all. I do think it is important that the interests of the more than 200,000 people in Alaska be recognized even though the main consideration has to do with more than 160 million highway users elsewhere.

Alaska is the only one of the States or Territories not included within the Federal aid highway system. Puerto Rico is included. Hawaii is included. Even the District of Columbia is included. But not Alaska.

All our public domain roads are now built by direct appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in the annual Interior Department appropriation bill. Of course, supplementary funds are advanced by the Territory of Alaska, although not according to an established formula.

So if H. R. 7474 should be enacted or any bill with similar taxing provisions, it will mean that Alaskans will have to pay more for gasoline, more for diesel fuel for highway vehicles, more for tires—without a dollar being returned for roads. I submit that this is altogether unfair. At this time we play our part in making available Federal funds for road construction and road maintenance by the Department of the Interior on the Alaska public domain in that we pay all highway taxes applied to Americans elsewhere. Now it is intended apparently to impose upon us these very substantial increases without any benefits being returned.

Long ago I took up with the Clay Committee the proposition of devising a formula so that Alaska might be included in the administration's highway plans.

The reply made to me in effect said that it was well understood that Alaska's 586,000 square miles had a highway system extending only about 3,000 miles because the Federal Aid Acts were not applicable there; yet at the same time, because the general Federal system did not extend to the Territory of Alaska, the committee could not consider Alaska's needs. Subsequently, I urged upon the appropriate legislative committees what I considered the high desirability of making provision for Alaska roads under the accelerated building plans being advanced in the various bills which were taken up. Yet the net result is that no provision has been made for Alaska except that we shall be taxed along with those who will actually benefit from highway improvements which increased taxes will bring.

I cannot state with positiveness why it is that despite efforts made at various times Alaska has never been included in the Federal Highway System. It is certain that it must be if the country is to be opened up by the same type of road-building program which has had such marvelous results elsewhere under the American flag.

The report on H. R. 7474 states that it is intended to produce revenues sufficient for a pay-as-you-go highway building program. So far as Alaska is concerned, it will be a stay-where-you-are program. Alaskans will pay but they will not go. They will not be permitted to.

The report elsewhere states that "Because the committee believes that the additional burdens resulting from its tax program should fall largely upon highway users, it has made provision for the exemption of nonhighway users. The committee has also attempted to concentrate the burden upon those who will benefit most directly from the improvement of the Nation's highway system." Using then the committee's own criteria, I want to suggest with all possible emphasis that before final action is had upon a highway bill that justice and equity demand that Alaska be exempted from its taxing provisions.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before us.

Earlier today, I voted against the rule under which the Highway Act of 1955 was brought before this House. I did this because I objected to the conditions outlined in the rule, which prohibit amendments to section 4 of the bill, other than those proposed by members of the Public Works Committee.

Now, to me section 4 of the bill before us is of grave importance. This section, in effect, increases taxes on highway users by some \$12 billion over the period of time involved in this legislation. Twelve billion dollars is a tremendous amount of money. I felt that the proposed tax increases warranted a full study by the Ways and Means Committee, which is the taxwriting committee of this House. While I am wholeheartedly in favor of financing highway improvements on a pay-as-you-go basis, I did not feel that a \$12 billion tax boost should be voted without prior study of

the subject by the Ways and Means Committee, or without opening that section of the bill to floor amendments.

This issue, however, was settled when the majority of this House voted to accept the rule. What we have to consider now is the overall highway bill.

I am in favor of the bill because it will help to solve our highway problem. Now most of us will agree that the economy of our Nation is greatly dependent upon motor-vehicle transportation. We will also agree that we have failed to keep our highway systems adequate to meet our needs, and that we have piled up a backlog of deficiencies which will have to be overcome if our economy is not to become stagnated.

In 1946, 9 years ago, we had some 34 million motor vehicles registered in the United States. This year, the registrations have reached the 58-million mark. Further, it is estimated that within 10 years that number will be increased to 81 million.

While this astonishing increase has been taking place, our expenditures for highway construction and improvements have lagged behind. In terms of 1941 dollars, we spent less on highway programs in 1953 than we did in 1938, even though the number of registered motor vehicles had almost doubled between those two dates.

Such a state of affairs cannot be permitted to continue. We must try to improve our highway program, and we must do so quickly.

I believe that the bill before us will help us to solve our national highway problem. It is true that the bill does not go as far as some people feel it should go. Nevertheless, it is a constructive piece of legislation and it merits our support. It is my hope that the bill will be approved without delay.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, on June 30 of this year the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a Presidential commission, sometimes referred to as the Kestenbaum Commission, on which 5 members of this House serve, completed 2 years of arduous work in studying various grants-in-aid programs. Among the topics to receive considerable attention and study is the matter of improved highways. I have not had an opportunity to study the application of general principles which the Commission recommends to the bill now pending, but I do wish to call to the attention of the House the principal recommendations of the Commission as set forth in its report. It is to be regretted that the report was delayed and that few Members of the House have had an opportunity to study the detailed recommendations and findings of this Commission. It will take but a few moments to read the principal recommendations and with your indulgence I shall do that. I shall include as a part of my remarks the entire chapter on highways.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who rendered an excellent service as a member of the Commission.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not true that the Commission spent a great deal of time considering the problem of State and Federal relationships with respect to highways and that probably we had more discussion and more controversy about this subject than any other single subject that was studied by the Commission? We considered it from the very beginning and found ourselves finally in pretty good agreement on it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes; that is certainly true, and I appreciate the contribution of my friend from Iowa.

Here are the Commission's recommendations:

The Commission recommends that the actual construction and maintenance of highways be performed by the States and their subdivisions.

The Commission recommends that the present Federal-aid highway program be continued and that funds appropriated thereunder be increased. The increase in funds should be so allocated as (1) to give recognition to the national responsibility for highways of major importance to the national security, including special needs for civil defense, and (2) to provide for accelerated improvement of highways in order to insure a balanced program to serve the needs of our expanding economy.

The Commission recommends that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor fuel taxes.

The Commission recommends a reduction in the extent and degree of Federal supervision accompanying highway grants-in-aid.

The Commission recommends the repeal of provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright Act requiring the States to expend certain amounts of specific taxes for highway purposes.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the recommendations which I have just read I believe that the Members would be interested in the comments of chapter 11 of the report and with permission of the House I am including it in my remarks as follows:

CHAPTER 11 HIGHWAYS

From the inception of our Federal system, a nationwide interest in highways has been recognized. The Constitution itself gives Congress the powers to establish post-roads and to regulate commerce among the States.

During the first 40 years of the Republic, many turnpikes were constructed by private companies seeking profit through tolls. Some of the States invested in the securities of the turnpike companies. In 1806, the National Government began construction of the National Pike, or Cumberland Road, and by 1819 the road extended 131 miles from Cumberland, Md., to Wheeling, W. Va., on the Ohio River. By 1819, Pennsylvania had completed a surfaced highway from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

Soon after the development of the steam locomotive in 1830, the resources of the country were directed to construction of railroads, and highways entered a period of neglect. Until almost the turn of the 20th century, local governments handled such road building as was done. A good-roads movement in the late 19th century was spearheaded by a coalition of bicyclists demanding smooth roads for recreation, farmers wanting to get out of the mud, and railroad interests seeking feeders to their lines. During the 1890's State aid to counties for road construction was begun and several State highway departments were organized. The movement spread rapidly,

particularly after the automobile appeared. By 1917, all States were participating in highway development.

In the same period, the National Government developed an interest in highways that has continued to the present day. An Office of Road Inquiry, established in the Department of Agriculture in 1893, eventually became the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. Federal highway activities, including aid to the States, are presently centered in this Bureau. From 1893 to 1912, the Bureau's functions were limited to investigation and research. In 1912, the Congress authorized \$500,000 for an experimental program in rural postroad construction. The Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916 continues to be a part of the basic legislation governing Federal highway aid. It authorized Federal aid funds of \$75 million over a 5-year period and, together with legislation enacted in 1921, established the principles of (1) limiting Federal aid to construction projects on designated primary highway systems, (2) apportioning funds among States by statutory formula, and (3) requiring State matching of Federal aid in fixed proportions.

During the depression of the 1930's, the National Government participated in highway construction through various emergency programs which were outside the regular channels of highway aid. As a matter of fact, in every year from 1936 to 1941, inclusive, emergency highway aid exceeded regular aid by substantial amounts.

New regular aid programs for designated urban extensions of primary highways and for a limited mileage of secondary roads were initiated under the Highway Act of 1944. This act also provided for selection of a national system of interstate highways limited to 40,000 miles. Authorization of aid specifically for the interstate highway system was first provided in the 1952 act.

Extent of Federal aid

Regular Federal highway aid (as distinguished from special or emergency aid) has supplied only 8.51 percent of total revenues used for all highway purposes over the 33-year period since 1921. By intervals, the percentages are: 1921-31, 5.76 percent; 1932-42, 9.19 percent; 1943-53, 9.49 percent. However, regular Federal aid has supplied much larger percentages of expenditures for highway construction, as shown in the following comparison:

	Total highway construction expenditures	Regular Federal aid	Percentages
	Million	Million	
1921-31.....	\$12,106	\$1,075	8.88
1932-42.....	13,686	2,254	16.47
1943-53.....	18,330	3,328	18.16
	44,122	6,657	15.09

¹ Average.

It is estimated that total expenditures for highway construction in 1954 were \$3.7 billion, of which \$2.1 billion was expended on systems eligible for Federal aid. About \$600 million, or 16 percent, of the \$3.7 billion represented Federal funds.

Federal aid authorizations for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 total \$575 million; for 1956 and 1957 the total is \$875 million for each year, as follows:

	Each fiscal year 1954 and 1955	Each fiscal year 1956 and 1957
Interstate system.....	\$25,000,000	\$175,000,000
Primary system.....	247,500,000	315,000,000
Secondary system.....	165,000,000	210,000,000
Urban highways.....	137,500,000	175,000,000

There is considerable lag between the authorization figures and actual appropriations. Payments are made only as money is needed to meet State claims for reimbursement; claims are not filed until actual construction begins.

National participation in the total highway expenditure varies greatly from State to State. When expressed in terms of all highway costs, including planning, construction, maintenance, interest, and administrative overhead, the percentages of Federal aid in 1952 highway expenditures were 3.7 percent in New Jersey, 4 percent in Maryland, and 8.6 percent in California. At the other extreme, percentages were 35.1 in Wyoming, 33.5 in Nevada, and 26.6 in New Mexico. When expressed in terms of construction costs only, the National Government's share ranged from 6 percent in New Jersey to 53.9 percent in Nevada.

Federal aid is apportioned among the States by statutory formulas which give weight to population, land area, and specified road mileage. Prior to the 1954 act, dollar for dollar matching of all Federal funds was required in most States, an exception being made for States in which unappropriated and unreserved public lands and non-taxable Indian lands constituted more than 5 percent of the total area. In these States the matching requirements were reduced according to the amount of such lands. The 1954 Federal-Aid Highway Act reduced the State matching share from 50 to 40 percent for the interstate system, again providing a downward adjustment for States with large public-land areas. State per capita income is not taken into account in either the allotment or the matching process.

Allocation of responsibilities

Large public expenditures for highways during the past three decades have produced a highway network which in many respects is the finest and most extensive in the world. But the highway system as a whole does not yet measure up to the growth of population and traffic, economic advancement, and change, and imperative defense needs. If, indeed, the highway situation is critical, then the National, State, and local governments all have a vital stake and a large obligation in its rectification. If the United States is to maintain and advance its productive and defensive strength, which depends so largely upon the efficiency and economy of the transportation system, an acceleration of the rate of highway improvement is needed, particularly with respect to major highways. Consequently, the Commission bases its recommendations upon the necessity for a stepped-up highway construction program during the next 5 to 10 years.

In the view of the Commission, the primary responsibility for highway development rests with States and their subdivisions. A preponderant proportion of the country's total highway mileage is intrastate or primarily local in character, and State and local highway departments by and large are competent and adequate. However, the national interest in an adequate highway system is so great as to justify action by the National Government, at certain times and under certain conditions, in encouraging and supplementing State action. National-State highway relationships should be flexible, not static. Under normal conditions States can and should fulfill their responsibilities for highway functions with a minimum of Federal aid. But when defense needs or economic conditions disrupt the status quo, the National Government should expand its role.

In the light of these premises, the following recommendations are submitted:

The Commission recommends that the actual construction and maintenance of highways be performed by the States and their subdivisions.

The National Government should give technical assistance to and cooperate with the States on problems of highway construction and maintenance. However, only in those cases where a highway is built in a National park, reservation, or similar area, or as limited access to a Federal facility, should construction be undertaken by the National Government.

It would be a basic mistake and wasteful duplication for the National Government to embark upon a new program of actually building, maintaining, and operating any large segment of the highway network. Highway construction and maintenance have been handled by the States and localities with consistent competence.

The Commission recommends that the present Federal aid highway program be continued and that funds appropriated thereunder be increased. The increase in funds should be so allocated as (1) to give recognition to the National responsibility for highways of major importance to the national security, including special needs for civil defense, and (2) to provide for accelerated improvement of highways in order to insure a balanced program to serve the needs of our expanding economy.^{1 2}

¹ Mayor Henderson believes that in carrying out the recommended highway program, greater emphasis ought to be placed upon the development of highways in urban areas.

² Mr. Burton, Governors Thornton, Jones, and Shivers, Senator Schoeppel, and Congressman Dolliver join in the following statement:

"We regretfully dissent from this major highway recommendation by the Commission. The recommendation endorses a permanent direction we believe to be unsound.

"In recent years State executives had substantially moved to a position of supporting State assumption of highway responsibilities upon the release of national highway user revenue sources for State use. This could not be done suddenly and was subject to reservations regarding federally impacted areas and the circumstances of States wherein there was a low ratio of population to highway mileage like the Western States with their large area of Federal land holdings.

"We likewise recognize that an important exception should be made for purposes of economic stabilization, and also for the need to 'catch up' on current highway deficiencies in the interstate system and metropolitan arterial systems. We are deeply impressed by the persuasive argument of the President that this Nation mobilize all its forces to arrest the terrible traffic toll upon human life, and that the National and State Governments work together on this important task. We believe that national assistance in 'catching up' is warranted by safety, military, and civilian defense necessities.

"Nevertheless, the above reservations are minor alterations of the principle of State responsibility and the 'catch-up' needs are of an emergency nature—but a real emergency. Federal assistance can speed the time when the ultimate fiscal and administrative highway responsibilities can be returned to the States and we believe that the Commission should be definitive in recommending this.

"We believe that every effort should be made to conduct the program on a pay-as-you-go basis. We are not intransigent in this matter but stress the importance of a sound balance of urgent need, fullest possibilities of current financing, and the capacity of contractors to do the job."

³ Governors Driscoll and Battle dissent, as follows:

"We do not question the need for a greatly improved highway system. The States have recognized this need and have established new records for highway construction. In the development of a highway program it is

The Commission is cognizant of existing critical highway needs and of the efforts being exerted by all levels of government to meet them. Total governmental highway expenditures for 1954 are estimated at \$6.4

unwise to pledge gasoline taxes that may be paid 10 years from now to meet today's needs. It is equally unwise during a period of comparatively full employment for the Nation to go substantially into debt to meet its highway requirements. Likewise, there must be a reasonable balance between the construction program and the ability of contractors to build roads on a competitive basis.

"The Commission's proposal, when compared with the unrealistic programs presently being considered, is moderate. Its advocacy of a pay-as-you-go program for free public highway is commendable. However, we must dissent from the Commission's recommendation for an increase in highway grants for the following reasons:

"(1) Responsibility for the construction and maintenance of a modern nationwide highway system should rest with the States. They have demonstrated their ability to cooperate with one another in the development of an interstate system. Within the various regions of this country, they are more conscious of their own and one another's needs than any agency of the National Government. If given the opportunity to do so, they may be expected to meet the national interest.

"(2) While the total contribution of the National Government for highway construction is small in comparison with the contribution of the States and their political subdivisions, its impact on State budgets and policies is substantial because of a wide variety of administrative and policy controls. These range all the way from an attempt by the National Government to compel the States to dedicate State taxes to a discrimination against toll roads and parkways. In addition, the Government has sought to control wages, establish national standards, choose routes, and more recently an attempt has been made to control the use of margin areas along federally aided highways. Any increases in highway grants may be expected to increase the budgetary impact and further curtail the fiscal independence of the States. History discloses that representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads have on more than one occasion advocated increased authority over State highways. An increase in the grants will tend to give the National Government a dominant vested interest, with Federal control the inevitable consequence.

"(3) The proposal continuing two or more levels of government in a single operation increases costs, retards construction, and results in wasteful duplication and overlapping of effort where none is necessary.

"(4) There is a better way to accelerate the construction of an adequate national highway system. The present Federal gasoline tax should be repealed. This may be done outright or on a tax offset basis, as in the case of the unemployment compensation tax. If the later procedure is adopted, it should be the prelude to outright repeal of the tax. The gasoline tax now being collected by the National Government was first imposed as a temporary tax to meet an emergency situation and has long been regarded by many as a tax that should be returned to the States. In a limited number of States which have large Federal land holdings and in which the need for highway aid may be demonstrated, it should be granted for a limited period out of general revenues of the National Government.

"(5) The funds required to support the grant-in-aid device are collected from the citizens of the States. The States with the greatest density of population, the greatest

billion, compared to \$4.9 billion 3 years earlier. Legislation enacted in 1954 increased Federal financial assistance to the States for highway purposes by more than 50 percent. However, there is abundant evidence that the current rate of highway improvement is not sufficient to meet current emerging needs. Failure to meet these needs will seriously affect the national security and the national economy. Humanitarian considerations alone, in terms of reducing the annual toll of highway accidents, call for vigorous action in revamping the unsafe segments of the highway network.

The Commission believes that there is sound justification for Federal participation in the improvement of many highways. The Commission generally approves existing legislation, which provides Federal aid for primary highways, including interstate routes and urban extensions, and for secondary roads, including farm-to-market roads.

The Commission believes that present circumstances justify a concentration of increased Federal highway funds on a limited mileage of highways of key importance to interstate commerce and to military and civilian defense. However, this does not mean that other highways now eligible for Federal highway aid should be neglected in an expanded program.

The Commission believes that civil defense is primarily a responsibility of the National Government. This has particular relevance in the case of highways required for civil defense. Special and costly features needed to adapt new roads to civil defense needs should be financed largely by the National Government.

The Commission considers toll highways a matter of State and local policy. Present and past Federal-aid highway acts have provided, however, that no tolls may be charged on roads partly financed by the National Government. The Commission endorses this principle and recommends that no Federal aid be given for any toll road.

Financing and supervision

The Commission recommends that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor-fuel taxes.*

highway needs, and the largest number of traffic accidents are likewise the States whose citizens make the largest contribution to the Federal Treasury. These are also the States to which the largest highway grants will be given. This unnecessary and wasteful 'exchange' of tax dollars inevitably strengthens the centralization of our Government in Washington. In fact, the grant-in-aid programs that have been proposed are more likely to strengthen centralized bureaucracy than to speed highway construction. By requiring more dollars for administration, these programs leave fewer dollars for pavements. By the same token they weaken State and local governments. As de Tocqueville said: 'A democratic people tends toward centralization, as it were by instinct. It arrives at provincial institutions only by reflection.'

*Mr. Folsom dissents from this recommendation:

"The Nation's needs for an improved interstate highway system are urgent. Unless taxes are increased substantially, borrowing may be needed to finance accelerated construction of this system. The borrowing needed should be done on a self-liquidating basis with the amount of debt related to anticipated highway-user revenues. Regardless of the method of financing, Federal highway expenditures should be paid for from highway-user revenues only, not from general tax revenues."

Mrs. Hobby, Mr. Burton, and Governor Thornton join in this dissent.

The effect of the Commission's recommendation on highway aids will be to increase Federal expenditures substantially. Additional revenues should be provided to meet a major share of these expenditures. An increase in taxes is preferable to deficit financing as a means of supporting larger highway outlays by the National Government. The latter method would result in high interest charges and would shift the burden to citizens of a future generation, who will have continuing highway and other governmental responsibilities of their own to finance.

The Commission recommends a reduction in the extent and degree of Federal supervision accompanying highway grants-in-aid.

Congress should be constantly alert to prevent procedural abuses by any administrative agency to which it may delegate duties. Federal agencies should diminish controls over the details of State highway planning, design, and construction. Over the years, the Bureau of Public Roads has made a notable contribution to highway improvement in this country through technical leadership and the stimulation and coordination of State activity in this field. However, in the light of the maturity and competence of most State highway departments, it appears to the Commission that the Bureau of Public Roads could relax much of its close supervision of State highway work. The Bureau has already made a good start but more can be done.

The 1954 Highway Act sensibly permits, under certain conditions, the substitution of certifications by State highway authorities for detailed compliance checks by the National Government. National legislation and administrative regulations of the Bureau of Public Roads might well leave the States free to carry forward their highway programs, simply certifying that they have complied with Bureau requirements. Through spot checks of performance and through complete accounting records, the Bureau could forestall misuse of Federal funds.

Although the Commission favors relaxation of Federal supervision, it believes that the National Government should continue to prescribe basic minimum standards for the construction of federally aided highways. Moreover, where interstate highway connections are involved, the Bureau of Public Roads should continue to exercise strong guidance.

The Commission recommends the repeal of provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright Act requiring the States to expend certain amounts of specific taxes for highway purposes.

The National Government may rightfully require State matching of aid which it extends, as the law already provides. Beyond this the National Government should not go. The States should be free to use their tax revenues as they see fit. Elsewhere in this report the Commission has urged a careful reappraisal by the States of all constitutional and statutory requirements, such as earmarking of specific taxes, which fetter the ability of the States and their subdivisions to deal with their fiscal problems. Certainly the National Government should not add to the fiscal problems of the States by imposing additional and unnecessary restrictions.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to put in the RECORD something which bears out what has already been well said here today. That is, this is not a political matter. While it is not a political matter I think we all have a right to a difference of opinion. I hold in my hand a telegram which I

would like to read, and may I say, incidentally, that I am not the only one to receive this telegram. It reads as follows:

Before recording your position on pending highway program and related tax increases, I respectfully urge further study of the far reaching effects of such legislation on basic economy of our State. My appeal for your consideration is based on conviction that harmful results must follow imposition of huge burden of new taxes on motor vehicles now widely used in practically all branches of New York industry, agriculture, and commerce. Suggestion that more thought be given tax question is addressed to entire New York delegation regardless of party affiliation. Am certain every Representative in both parties wants to safeguard the future prosperity of our State just as much as I do. Cannot help regarding proposed increases in excises on vehicles, other equipment, tires, tubes, etc., as burdensome and discouraging to operators, but wish to comment in particular on much larger sums involved in suggested increases on motor fuel. Some Members of Congress from New York may not realize that present State and Federal taxes on motor fuel now take \$180 million yearly out of pockets of our vehicle owners. New State and Federal taxes passed this year or now pending would add \$90 million beginning January 1, 1956, raising total to \$270 million, annually. Of this tremendous sum, motor-trucks, which are the work horses of the economy and provide services essential to every family and all business, will be forced to pay 30 percent or \$80 million yearly. I believe such drastic measures call for more thorough study even if decision on question has to go over to next session.

Regards,

I would just like to say that the telegram is from James A. Farley, who certainly has the interest of our State at heart and certainly cannot be accused of being a partisan of my side of the aisle.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], asked a question as to the adequacy of the program and as to the statement that Secretary Humphrey made while he was a witness before the committee. I read now from the committee print so that this may be straight in the RECORD:

Mr. Boggs. I have just one other question. As I understand your answer to my previous question, it is that if this bill provides the necessary revenues out of current revenues, then you approve the bill. Is that correct?

Secretary HUMPHREY. To do the job. Any bill that will do the job in the necessary time and that will raise sufficient revenue to pay as we go is the thing I cannot object to as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Now let me follow that with another quote from Mr. Boggs and the Secretary:

Mr. Boggs. One final question and I am finished.

Secretary HUMPHREY. The only thing, Mr. Boggs, this committee must not do, is to pass a bill and not provide some way of financing it.

Mr. Boggs. One final question. Have you studied the tax schedules proposed in this bill?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I have. Yes, sir.

Mr. Boggs. What do you think of them?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think that it will raise the money outlined. I think the figures and the computations are correct as

nearly as can be reasonably estimated, and I think it will raise the amount of money over the period approximately as they are outlining it. * * *

Mr. Boggs. Do you think the proposal is fair and equitable?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is a very big question.

Mr. Boggs. It sure is.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it is a pretty good spread of the taxes that would be required among the people that will benefit from a substantially improved highway system.

Mr. Boggs. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure you have just heard of the Kastenbaum pay-as-you-go report. I feel this so strongly because I know the problem West Virginia has had to meet its costs, and I know in that State they have paid as they go, and they have gotten pretty good roads for the money they have been spending.

Mr. Chairman, the highway-aid bill now under consideration by this body is the most important piece of legislation to be discussed here this session. We had more than 15 weeks of debate on this bill in our committee. Its success or failure can have a vital impact on the economic well-being of this country over the next 2 or 3 decades. Everyone testifying before our committee realized that we needed the highways. Not a single person would say we did not need the highways.

I am sure that no one here has any doubt of the extreme need to plan and accelerate the construction of a bigger and better highway system in the United States. We have 90- to 100-mile-per-hour cars and 30- to 40-mile-per-hour highways. So you can see easily why there is the slaughter on the highways that the Members have been talking about this afternoon.

It is a matter which demands action now. At the present time, there are 58 million automobiles, 10 million trucks, and 250,000 buses crowding our highway system. Traffic experts predict the total will increase to more than 80 million motor vehicles in the next 10 years, an increase of 40 percent.

There is no doubt in my mind that an adequate highway system in this country is the key to the continued expansion of our national economy. In the next 15 years, the population of the United States may well grow to 200 million people and whether employment and family income continue to rise will depend to a great extent on the highway building program outlined in this bill—the Fallon bill.

The motor vehicle is no longer a luxury in the United States. It is a necessity; our everyday pattern of life is based on it. Yet, we have done virtually nothing since the end of World War II to expand or improve the web of highways that bisects this country.

Do you realize that we are spending only one-half as much money as we did 20 to 30 years ago, as compared with the expansion of the economy since that time, on highways?

Work should begin immediately to build broad new traffic arteries across the country, to resurface and widen existing roads and eliminate the thousands of

miles of dirt roads which still carry some of this country's motor vehicles.

This is a point that I want to drive home to those from the rural areas. This bill will carry a 90-10 provision that will relieve sums of money for primary and secondary roads, large sums of money. Not only that, but there will be \$25 million more per year to be added to the primary and secondary roads of our country as listed in the Fallon bill.

Not only our economic well-being, but our military strength too, depends upon a smoothly geared network of good highways. Every day lost in providing this network of first-class highways may mean disaster as the result of delay in moving defense equipment and the evacuation of our people in the event of enemy attack.

Although there have been differences of opinion here as to the proper method by which to finance this gigantic undertaking, I believe the consensus is unanimous that the continued prosperity and safety of this Nation demands that the Congress take action to overcome the major road deficiencies as rapidly as possible.

I am prepared to vote in favor of the bill as it has been reported to the House by the Public Works Committee, including the provisions to increase taxes on highway users and provide \$12,400,000,000 in additional funds for highway construction between now and July 1, 1971.

During consideration of the bill in committee I offered an amendment, which was accepted, to exempt from any increased Federal tax on gasoline the off-highway users of gasoline. In my opinion, this was the only fair attitude the committee could adopt, in view of the fact that the off-highway user of gasoline does not contribute in any way to the deterioration of our highways.

I see no reason why a company which has motor vehicles using gasoline for fuel and operating strictly within the confines of its plants, should be taxed to support public highways. Many companies which fall within this category are, at the same time, contributing their share toward maintaining the public roads through the purchase of gasoline to power motor vehicles which they use on the highways.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I introduced my amendment to section 4 of H. R. 7474, the amendment which has come to be known as the Burnside amendment. I think it entirely fair. It would apply not only to the plants I just mentioned but, for example, to farmers who use rubber-tired, gasoline- or diesel-propelled machinery entirely on their farms. In practically every case these people own cars or trucks which are used on the highways and which would be subject to the additional tax imposed. To tax their farm machinery, however, would be to impose a double burden, a burden which our farmers can ill afford, when they are finding it so difficult to farm profitably. Mr. Chairman, I know you are familiar with the drastic decline suffered recently by the coal-mining industry. West Virginia mines use a great deal of machinery which is operating almost entirely underground, which never sees the light of day. To impose the

additional tax upon this machinery when the very companies which operate the mines where it is used also frequently use fleets of trucks which will be taxed on the highways would be most unjust. This, too, is avoided by my amendment, which the committee approved. In the case of both farms and mines, I think that it is vital that we take no action which will discourage the use of modern equipment. I would not want to impose a tax on machinery used either in mines or on farms if that tax would discourage the use of machinery which enables farmers to employ modern agricultural methods and which makes it easier for miners in their very difficult and dangerous work. These, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the examples where I think my amendment relieves what would otherwise have been injustice. The same situation is true in many other fields as well. Trucks and other machinery used entirely in the woods in lumbering operations and other off-highway users are exempted.

I do not see how the committee could have approached the problem of paying for our roads in a fairer way. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, in light of the Burnside amendment No. 2, which eliminated from additional taxation all camelback used to recap tires with a 6-inch crown or less. Now, Mr. Chairman, that would eliminate taxes on camelback for recapping medium and small size tires such as those used on Fords, Chevrolets, Plymouths, and so forth. I also included in this amendment the cutting of the diesel tax from 5 cents a gallon to 4 cents a gallon. These amendments, I feel, eliminated inequities. I am glad to say that the Committee on Public Works adopted them.

The bill as it is presently constituted provides a pay-as-you-go approach to the problem of financing this highway program, an approach which I believe is the most practical. Support for this type of financing is contained in many of the statements made before the committee by experts in the highway field.

The United States has been operating too long with horse-and-buggy highways in an economy which demands broad, new, streamlined traffic arteries for maximum strength and efficiency. This bill is a step toward providing that streamlined system.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the House finds itself in a unique position with regard to highway legislation today. Usually we have more problems than cures. In this situation we have as many, or more, proposed cures than problems. Yesterday one of my constituents inquired whether H. R. 7474 was the 7,474th bill proposed in this session or the 7,474th highway bill.

One place where there does seem to be a unanimity of opinion is in the fact that we face a critical situation with regard to highways unless vigorous action is taken immediately. We are told that in 1946

there were 34 million vehicles. Today there are 58 million, and 10 years hence the figure will be 81 million.

In order that we select the proper palliative from among the vast array of legislative nostrums that have been offered to us, it is my feeling that we should go back to first principles—that we should pay less attention to the alleged wonders of each proposed cure and more attention to the basic symptoms of our patient.

First, the study I have made of the highway problem in Nevada and elsewhere in the West seems to indicate that this body should strive for legislation which would permit long-range planning and orderly development.

It has been the custom for many years for Congress to make highway legislation containing authorizations for subsequent 2-year periods. With the passage of S. 1048 by the other body, this was increased to a 5-year period. Even such an increase, however, does not enable the long-range planning which is necessary to smoothly and efficiently accomplish the mammoth task which faces us. I am pleased that both of the major proposals facing us today, that is H. R. 7474 and the recommendations of the Clay committee, which I understand will be offered in the Dondero amendment, cover a much longer period of time. This will make possible orderly development of our highway facilities and permit necessary long-range consideration.

Secondly, it is my feeling that any highway legislation that comes out of this body should be as much as possible on a pay-as-we-go basis. Insofar as it can be ascertained those who receive the benefits should bear the economic burden which is a necessary part of the construction of the improved facilities. In this respect I feel that provisions of H. R. 7474 are preferable to the financial scheme contained in the Clay committee report.

I do not mean to say that I approve entirely of the new tax revenues that are included in the provisions of this bill. I regret that a closed rule does not permit this House to speak its will with respect thereto.

However, I am pleased that the present excise taxes contained in this measure represent a great improvement over those contained in H. R. 7072, which was reported from the Public Works Committee several weeks ago.

There is almost no one who opposes at this time an enlarged highway construction program. Chief dispute centers on the financial provisions involved in the respective proposals. With the national debt limit in excess of \$275 billion, I feel it important insofar as possible that we pay the expenses of the enlarged program as we proceed to construct the roads and facilities.

Therefore, it is my feeling that we should continue the status quo on the Federal-aid system and place chief emphasis on the interstate network because it will make the greatest contribution to national defense and the development of our economy. In Nevada, for example, our main highway problems are U. S. 40, which passes over Donner Sum-

mit, and U. S. 91 which runs between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. There are dangerous, time-wasting bottlenecks on both of these roads that should be eliminated at the earliest possible opportunity.

There are certain provisions, however, of H. R. 7474 which, in my opinion, are not satisfactory in their present form. First, the provision of paragraph 2 (c) which imposes weight and size limitations on trucks using the interstate system will have a discriminatory effect on States such as my own. The legislation provides that if a State does not now have laws and regulations, it will be given until March 1, 1956, to complete consideration thereof. Where the State legislature meets only in the odd-numbered years, such as in Nevada, this precludes an opportunity for the State legislature to deliberate on the problem and may well freeze into effect undesirable limitations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much said today with regard to the need for additional highway facilities here in America. Let me review briefly some of those needs to make certain we understand just exactly what they are and the fact that either by the expenditure of some of this money resulting from additional taxes or, in the alternative, the setting up of this Corporation and paying for construction through a bond-issue program, is needed if we are to provide for these highways. It is absolutely essential at this time that something be done immediately to solve this problem, and that it not be put off.

The annual savings as the result of the interstate system alone, and that is the 40,000-mile system alone, would be in lives 3,500 per year. The cost of accidents would be reduced by 250 percent if just this 40,000-mile interstate system were completed. The total cost yearly resulting from not having a complete interstate system is \$2.1 billion, an amount equal to the amount to be expended under either of the proposals presently under consideration. So I think that alone clearly shows that this highway program is needed.

In addition, there will be savings estimated in automobile operation as follows: The average automobile saving would be 1 cent per mile resulting from the completion of the interstate system alone. There is an argument over whether or not the increased tax of 1 cent per gallon is equitable with an average operation of 15 miles per gallon and a savings, thus, of 15 cents per gallon.

As to the operation of trucks, it is estimated that for those who operate on the interstate system the saving will be 4 cents a mile, and the average mileage of diesel trucks is 6 miles per gallon, meaning they are saving 24 cents per gallon on the operation of diesel fuel, and the suggestion is there be 2 cents additional per gallon on the diesel fuel.

It is a little bit difficult for me to see why under these circumstances the trucking interests are not being bene-

fitted substantially and claim to be so much discriminated against.

I want to point out further that of the amount of money to be raised, \$12 billion, only \$3 billion could by any stretch of the imagination be included in this so-called discriminatory tax classification—the difference between \$12 billion and \$9 billion.

Let me point out to you that the Clay report showed there are approximately 9,303,000 trucks in America today. If you take the \$3 billion over a 15-year period, that will be only \$200 million additional tax that group will have to pay, or \$22 per truck per year.

Let us be fair about it. Let us get down to the heavy trucks. Let us say the tax were limited to them alone, which it is not, and we would have then approximately 85,000 trucks, and a cost of approximately \$225 a year per truck, for getting the best highways they have had in the history of their trucking operation. Is this such a discriminatory tax then?

I personally have spent most of my time working for the President's program, the Clay plan. That gives the people additional roads without additional taxes. That is no sleight-of-hand trick. Anyone who has had any experience in municipal, State, or county financing knows that is the way we get things built today without having the money to do it today. We have to go out and borrow, and I have not found a financier who is willing to lend you money without charging you interest.

That is the situation. You have a situation with the Dondero proposal, the Clay proposal before you, where it has been suggested that we are going to have a 30-year freeze of the ABC roads, the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I want to suggest to you that is not true. In the first place, there is more money spent this year as the result of last year's authorization than has even been spent on primary, secondary, and urban roads in the country's history. That does not mean that this amount of money is going to be frozen for a 30-year period under the Dondero plan at all. If in the wisdom of this Congress it should see fit in the next session next year to vote more money for those primary, secondary, and urban roads, they can do it, just as they did back in 1954. So to say you are freezing in any way the ABC roads under the Dondero proposal is wholly inaccurate. The suggestion has been made that these roads are not going to last over a 30-year period.

In all fairness, on that question, that question was specifically asked of the road authority, Mr. du Pont, as he appeared before the committee, and he made the unqualified statement that the largest cost of your roads is not the surfacing material, but it is the providing of the rights-of-way and the undersurface, and that amounts to 70 percent of the cost and that that will last indefinitely. So you could not possibly be talking about more than 30 percent of the cost under any circumstances.

The value of the Dondero bill is that it gives you a road program without any

additional taxes. It does not in any way hamper or cripple the ABC road program. It also provides for a pay-as-you-use program. We have been discussing all types of programs here today—the pay-as-you-use program, the pay-as-you-go program, or tax program or the alternative Thompson bill, the not-pay-at-all program.

I favor paying as you use, with no additional taxes if this is possible under the present temperament of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have had a chance to stand in this well and address you. Because of that, I have one thing to ask of you. That if you ask me any questions please make them easy, because I know you are graduates in this game of legislation and I do not feel quite equal to combat some of the political questions from the floor.

I want at the outset to pay tribute to the chairman of our Subcommittee on Roads and Highways [Mr. FALLON] and to the members of the committee who sat through many, many hours patiently listening to volumes of testimony on this very important question of roads for America. At this point, I am constrained to remind you, especially you people who have been wondering when we are going to do something for America while we are doing something for people all over the world—here is the place where we can do something for America. I want to pay tribute to that great American appointed by our President, General Clay, and his committee who gave us an exhaustive study and a complete report and presented without question the great need for highways in America. It has been testified to by virtually hundreds, yes thousands of people who have the welfare of the economy of our country at heart. As I sat through the hearings on this very important committee on this important legislation, I could not help but be impressed with the fact that here we were in this committee and in this Congress presented with a proposition that is the greatest thing ever presented to this legislative body or any legislative body in any nation in all the history of the world for the economy, and for the economic welfare of our Nation. Therefore, it is of tremendous importance to the people we represent. You have heard a great deal about what it is going to cost and what it is going to cost if you do not have it. We, on the committee, were reminded that we were going to pay for this highway system whether we build it or not in increased costs of accidents and loss of lives. If nothing else makes it important, that one factor certainly ought to make it important to all of us. I should like in my few moments here to tell you a little about the governors of our 48 States and why it was that the vast majority of them came to us and testified in favor of this kind of legislation—maybe for not all of the Clay report in all its detail, but they were willing to accept the Clay report, in general, because it recognized the principle that

they have known and understood in their respective States for a long time, and that is the gasoline tax should be dedicated to the building of roads, and the Clay report does that very thing. It practically guarantees that the revenue from the gas tax will be used for the building of a road system. Therefore, they were willing to change their position of returning this tax to the States and fitting their plans in with this program of the interstate system.

Something has been said and a lot more will be said about the prerogatives of the Ways and Means Committee being taken over by the Public Works Committee, and I agree that that probably is not in order and as it should be; but being a member of that committee and its being assigned to us we had to do the very best we could. So with general agreement we gave 12 hours to it. In the beginning I agreed to it feeling it was not enough, and when we ended it I still felt it was not enough time to pass upon the testimony that was presented to us.

In spite of this, I think we had a pretty good answer to the tax question, and there are some good things in the tax provision presented in the Fallon bill. If we do not adopt it, I am rather hopeful that we will not, it can then be taken up by the Ways and Means Committee. All of the testimony heard before our committee can be of great use to the Ways and Means Committee as they consider it later.

We will have an opportunity to vote on three plans: The pay-as-you-build, the pay-part-and-borrow-part, and the Clay report.

I want to submit to you the Clay report as a compromise plan. That sounds strange, I know, but I present it to you as a compromise plan for the reason that I think it is a good plan and presents a plan to start the road program. The Ways and Means Committee can then act as it goes into session as soon as Congress convenes next year.

In closing let me just say this, let us not play politics with this, let us not for political reasons scuttle America's future economic prosperity, the happiness of its people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee has come before you today with several versions of highway bills upon which we have devoted a great deal of time. I think there is no question in the mind of the committee that there is an urgent need for highway improvement in this country. We had a tremendous amount of testimony before the committee as to the number of lives lost, the casualties inflicted, and the property damage incurred because we have not had adequate highways. So the decision we are making today is not whether or not we need expanded highways; the difference of opinion seems to be on the method of financing them.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not the American people are willing to pay what will be required for

the construction of adequate highways. May I say that in one county in my district in California the situation on roads became so critical, so crucial, that the people of that county voluntarily voted a bond issue by over two-thirds vote to raise \$10 million which to them in that one county was just as big as the total amount to be raised in the Clay proposal—\$10 million for one county to construct roads urgently needed. So I think that as long as they would vote that for themselves, it indicates the answer to this problem.

Those people voluntarily showed that they wanted those roads so badly they were willing to vote a bond issue for that purpose. I am of the opinion they have demonstrated the fact that they also would be willing to build the roads provided by the Clay plan. We have many other evidences of the fact that people are willing to invest in the future in a similar way. How many of your constituents go out and pay 100 percent cash for the homes they desire to buy? They know that their home is an investment in the future, they are glad to pay for it as they use that home. So they pay a part of it down and continue to pay for it year by year. They are willing and glad to pay interest because they are getting an asset that is well worth it. It is exactly similar to what we are proposing to do in the Clay plan which, may I say I am going to endorse and support when it comes before us.

I would like to mention one other thing in connection with the Dondero bill as it has been proposed here and which the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] mentioned a few moments ago. He had in mind submitting an amendment to provide for a Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage provision in the Dondero substitute bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] and I have discussed this and we are going to submit such an amendment so that there will be provided a Davis-Bacon provision in the Dondero version of the highway bill. It is our opinion that there should not be any difference between the Dondero bill and the Fallon bill on anything except basically the financing plan when the Dondero bill comes before this body. It is our understanding it will be possible to submit amendments to the substitute bill, therefore it is our intention to submit this amendment.

When we get to the consideration of the interstate highway system, we might as well recognize the fact that the same rules that apply to other Federal financing should apply there. The Davis-Bacon Act provision would provide that prevailing wages should likewise apply to the financing of the interstate highway system which now we are definitely recognizing in this act as primarily a Federal responsibility. So at the appropriate time such an amendment will be submitted and I hope we will have the support of the majority of the Members of this body when that amendment comes before you.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY].

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that major highway construction

is needed and that it will cost us almost as much, in actual dollars and cents, not to do the construction—and thus not have a modern road system—than it will to do it and thereby realize the kind of highway transportation system which is warranted by our highly industrialized economy.

May I presume to offer only brief comment on this legislation out of my several years' experience in highway administration. If the House should decide at this time to set up the construction of the interstate system, not by increment, as it might well do, but in its entirety, it would be my opinion that, in the interest of fiscal responsibility, and, in the interest of our country and its people, taxes should be imposed which would pay a substantial portion of its great cost of \$24 billion.

I should like to add, too, that it is my definite conviction that the tax provision of this bill is a fair one.

Legislation to effect highway improvement, desirable as it may be, should not serve as a vehicle for the inclusion of unjust, unfair, and unwise provisions which raid the Treasury and serve to defeat its primary purpose by robbing it of needed funds.

There is, from my viewpoint, one particularly vicious provision in this bill. It is section 7, which says to the States that they may give hundreds of millions of dollars to the utilities. Under the circumstances, this question of reimbursement is simply no business of the Congress. It should not be in this legislation because it is not right, either legally, equitably, or morally. It would perpetuate a wrong.

Just what does section 7 provide? Seemingly innocently enough, it says that—

Fifty percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities * * * may be paid from Federal funds whenever, under the laws of the State where the project is being constructed, the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utilities.

That sounds quite benign but what does it really mean? It actually means that regardless of the common law; regardless of the holdings of the courts of last resort; regardless of valid statutes enacted by the States under which permits have been given and are being given to utilities to place their facilities on the rights-of-way, solely under the condition that they would move them at their own expense to permit needed highway improvement; regardless of the tens of thousands of presently existing legal, written contracts that have been made between the States and the utilities, at the express request of the utilities, by which they were allowed to use highway rights-of-way for their facilities upon their contractual obligation to remove them when highway improvement was needed; regardless of the fact that the officials of the State highway department have made long trips to Washington on 2 occasions during the last 3 months to earnestly protest any inclusion of a reimbursement provision—regardless of all these things, this provision would say to the States that we offer you the money to do that which would vitiate your contracts, violate your State laws,

destroy your State's sovereignty, do that which you earnestly plead with us you do not want to do, and which you believe should not be done by you or anyone else—all for the sake of giving more than 99 percent of the money provided to firms not needing and not entitled to it.

The majority report says the utilities claim they did not know an expanded highway program would be undertaken when they signed these contracts. They said it but it is just so much hogwash. Why? One answer is that they have made some of these contracts, at their own specific request, in recent months, and after the projection of the expanded program. Another is that it has been known by everyone for a long, long time that our main highways had to be expanded and many utility executives have been active for years in campaigns to procure such expansion. Another is the fact that the utility lobby to put this over was set up in Washington, not this year, but in 1952 some 3 years before the Clay report. Because of the pressure of this lobby, and somewhat as a measure of defense against it, Congress, more than a year ago—and still before the Clay report—authorized a public-utility relocation study which was undertaken both by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Research Board of the National Academy of Science. Both studies certainly devastated the utilities on this issue but it did not devastate their lobby. It is still with us. Another convincing reason as to why this legislation did not spring from the effort to reconstruct the interstate system is the fact that it provided for reimbursement to the utilities, not just on the 40,000 miles of the interstate system, but on the entire 730,000 miles of the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban road system. This is done though the bill was supposed to be an interstate bill. No, there is nothing to their claim that they were in ignorance when they made the contracts. They made them because, doing so would save them hundreds of millions of dollars in right-of-way costs. It is a well-known fact that most of these utilities have bought little rights-of-way during their history and not one of them purchases rights-of-way when it can use that owned by others.

The majority report also states that isolated instances were cited where relocation costs were such as to seriously impair capital structure. The cases were so isolated that they practically did not exist. It is my opinion that it might be difficult to find even one case that would withstand an investigation of the facts. The leading witness for the utilities claimed that he would be practically ruined if Congress did not provide him reimbursement. He cited a case, or cases, in which he said his removal costs would be \$1 million or more, an expense which would only cost him \$480,000 since otherwise he would have to pay 52 percent of it in taxes. Further examination of this witness developed the fact that his firm is capitalized at more than \$300 million and that his revenue in the 13-year period during which he would have to relocate his facilities would be more than \$1,300,000,000. Just for the record, his indicated removal costs would be less

than one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of his revenues.

You will find more than 99 percent of utility ownership to be in much the same position financially. However, if there should happen to be a case of some small utility that would be really greatly burdened by facility readjustment cost, is it not reasonable to suppose that the State highway department, the officials and employees of which would be well known to the utility, probably would cooperate in some manner in helping him. Certainly we do not need to give practically the whole of this great sum of money to prosperous companies not entitled to it, in order to help some little fellow that might be found in some part of our country.

Would it not be a sad commentary, under the circumstances, for us, in effect, to try to force this authority on the States, an authority they do not want, an authority they pleadingly insist, if accepted and acted on by them, would be wrong in principle? If there is anything sacred in State sovereignty, it should be respected where the facts show it has been exercised so fully as it has by the States in this matter.

By passing this provision we simply would be sending the utility lobby back to the State capitols where it was working without success in this same endeavor before it decided to transfer its activity to Washington.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I feel very badly about this situation. I asked the Committee on Rules for more time. Sufficient time was not given in the Public Works hearings or before the Committee on Rules. I was promised at least 5 minutes and possibly 10, and now I find myself with only 3 minutes in which to discuss this matter.

I represent a section of Indiana in which is located the Cummins Engine Co. which started making engines in 1919. They spent 13 years developing what is the finest diesel engine on the market before they marketed the first motor. They spent vast sums of money perfecting that motor. The first year in which they operated in the black was 18 years later, in 1937. Now they manufacture more than 50 percent of all the diesel engines used in highway motor transportation.

That diesel engine costs twice as much as a gasoline engine and the excise tax is twice that paid on other engines. It is a heavier engine. It carries a net pay load less than that of gasoline engines. The principal factor that enables them to sell that engine, which is so essential to our mines and in our defense program today, is the fuel-economy differential. There is that economy differential between a gasoline motor and a diesel motor. Because of that differential the diesel people are able to sell that more expensive motor.

Now we would discriminate against this industry. We would do away with that fuel-economy differential, and in doing that we may put an industry out of business.

Some people who see heavy trucks along the highways seem to think they are all diesel powered. They are wrong. Actually, less than 2.3 percent of the heavy trucks in the East are diesel powered. The diesel motor is the best, the cleanest, the most perfect motor that can be built. It has more perfect combustion. That is how they get the fuel economy that you cannot get with any other type of motor. Gasoline motors put out 12,000 percent more poisonous carbon-monoxide gas than do the diesels. Other internal-combustion engines cannot meet the requirements of the Bureau of Mines for that reason.

So we see the diesel engine does operate a little more economically and safely. You get 10 cents a mile for driving your automobile today, if you work for the Government, but only 2 cents of that is spent for gasoline. Therefore, we can figure that only about 20 percent of the cost of operating a truck is for fuel.

It was first proposed in this bill to increase the diesel fuel tax 300 percent of its original, while the increased gasoline tax was only 150 percent of its original. The Public Works Committee cut down the diesel-gasoline differential, but a differential still remains. I regard that as discrimination, and discrimination is bad. I know we cannot amend the taxing features of this bill, but I call the attention of my colleagues to these discriminatory features, nonetheless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I am not so naive as to think that I am going to change anyone's opinion on this proposed legislation. However, I do want to clarify two things.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] went into some detail as to charges that had been made and news stories that appeared in the press, regarding the lobbies that had been operating around Washington in connection with this bill. He went on to state that the discriminatory tax naturally made it necessary for the rubber and trucking industries to come in and protect their interests.

Coming from the rubber capital of the world and the largest trucking center in the United States, I felt perhaps I should clarify the record. I perhaps am responsible in some degree for bringing in the trucking interests and the rubber interests. I was aware that the railroad lobby was operating here. I told my boys, "You better come down to Washington. These boys are really organized. If you don't hurry they will soon have the dome." And they got here.

The thing that really disturbed me was the fact the railroads were lobbying behind the scenes before the Fallon bill was introduced. On June 24 they sent out a letter, and this letter went out from the American Short Line Railroad Association, in which they recommended to their members that they contact Congressmen and get them to vote for a 50-cent-per-pound increase in the tire

taxes. I would like to read two paragraphs from this letter:

We believe two essential provisions—(1) limitation of vehicle sizes and weights and (2) graduated user charges on heavy vehicles—should be included in any legislation authorizing a Federal highway-aid program.

Then they went on to say to their membership:

If there is any hope of getting these two essential provisions in the final legislation, it must be done through your prompt efforts with as many Congressmen as you may properly approach.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman says "may properly approach."

Mr. AYRES. "With as many Congressmen as you may properly approach."

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman think it is proper for the railroads to take an interest in throwing stones in the way of competitors, that is to say, the trucking industry? Is that a proper approach?

Mr. AYRES. I do not think it is proper. By the same token, I do not think it is right for this Congress to enact discriminatory legislation that will put the trucking industry at a disadvantage and give a competitor an advantage.

Honestly, I am not too concerned about what is going to happen here this afternoon. I have sat here through the entire debate. I have heard the many discrepancies that have been discussed, many different opinions. Regardless of what bill we pass here this afternoon it will go over to the other body. The gentleman over there who will be heading the Finance Committee has stated he wants to take a good look at this bill, and when that gentleman takes a good look at it, he is on record over a period of years for never being for any discriminatory tax. They are well-versed in that field. I think it is quite significant that they have asked to take a look at it.

The other thing I am happy about is that not one member of the Committee on Ways and Means has come here this afternoon and said that the tax provisions in this bill are adequate.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take time here today, but I think there are several matters that need some clarification. I think the two gentlemen who just preceded me made a very good argument for their particular industry. However, I do want to call your attention to the fact that when Secretary Humphrey testified before our committee on July 12, I asked him a question, and that question was prompted by a series of questions asked just prior to that by my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I asked this question:

Mr. Secretary, I think you have answered most of my questions, but the series of questions my colleague from Michigan, Mr.

DONDERO, has asked you have raised in my mind an inference that probably the Clay plan might be more advisable because this plan would impose a burden which our committee could not stand.

I want to ask you this question in view of those series of questions: Do you feel this new bill, which has been proposed, this new proposal of taxes, would impose an unfair burden on our economy that any segment of it could not stand?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Your question has two points to it.

As to the first, as to the total, I would say "No," without any question.

As to whether this spread is absolutely fair in all respects, I haven't heard the testimony of other witnesses and I would hesitate to answer that.

My general impression is that it would not; but, as I say, I haven't heard the other witnesses.

I do think it is a fair spread.

So I think probably we have not too much to worry about as to whether or not this will ruin any particular segment of our economy.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is the gentleman saying to the Committee that neither the Fallon bill nor the Clay plan is the Republican plan, since it is supported by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. No; I most certainly will not.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Just a few moments ago, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] made an observation that I was going to agree with. He said that only \$3 billion of this proposed tax could possibly be discriminatory. I agree with that. It is just about \$3 billion. Is this good? There are other things too, but I will not labor the point. But, small business is vitally interested in what happens to the taxes on things that small-business men use, and on the stocks that they have in their stores. I also remember in the committee, I introduced an amendment which would have straightened out one of these inequities having to do with floor stocks of tires on which the small-business men have to pay taxes, but the factory-owned outlets do not have to pay taxes until the time of sale, and the gentleman from Florida made a point of order against my amendment. I think we are overlooking the small-business man here, and we ought to give them consideration.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I am sorry, my time is limited. I must decline to yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman made a statement which I am certain he would want corrected as to just what the Secretary said.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I am sorry. I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to bring out, and that is the fact that much has been said here about the Clay Committee report. But very little has been said about the report of another committee, the chairman of which was appointed by the Pres-

ident of the United States, and upon which five members of this Congress also participated. The gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Iowa said a few words about that, and I wish you would remember that on June 29 of this year the Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which Mr. Kestebaum was chairman and of which five Members of this Congress were members, unanimously stated that they do not favor the Clay report, but that they do favor a financing plan such as the one proposed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. May I state also that one gentleman for whom we all have high respect, Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, appeared before our committee and I think it would be useful for some of us to know what he said about the Clay report. Here is what he said before our committee about the Clay bill, the Dondero bill:

We think that the proposed method of financing is inadvisable because the result would be that the borrowing would not be included in the public debt obligation of the United States while the issuance of the corporation's bonds would be with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and they would be repaid from the permanent appropriation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that our national highway program should be accelerated. The real question is how and to what extent, within Federal and State budgets the program can be stepped up. Our Nation is tied together at the present by a network of highways which has sustained the unity of the Nation and has provided for the very basis of the name we bear—the United States. It is nevertheless the distinct obligation of the individual States and they should have the final say and control of all highways to be constructed within their borders. Locations, priorities, and so forth, should be made by the individual State highway departments after consultation with an appropriate Federal agency. This consultation should be a prime requirement because at the present due to the vastness of the country and many other problems peculiar only to the individual States, there exists a hodgepodge of construction and various proposals for linkage of the interstate system.

Each holiday that passes points up the fact that our present highway system is inadequate for existing traffic conditions, leave any defense traffic in the event of a national emergency. Improvements have not kept pace with increased traffic demands and cost of an inadequate system is high not only in wear and tear of automotive equipment, but also in accidents and loss of life. The present plight of our interstate system was forcibly brought to my attention during the hearings I conducted as chairman of the subcommittee for Civil Defense for the District of Columbia when the problems of evacuation were discussed.

Throughout our entire country, large-scale evacuation would be needed in the

event of an A-bomb attack. The Federal Civil Defense officials stated that the withdrawal task from our major cities would be the biggest problem ever yet faced, and a prime contributing factor was the highway system as it exists at present. For the information of those present, it is estimated that as a matter of Federal policy, at least 70 million people would have to be evacuated from target areas in case of threatened enemy attack. No urban area in the country today has highway facilities equal to this task. The rapid improvement of the complete 40,000-mile interstate system, including the necessary urban connections, is therefore a very vital civil and national defense matter.

I am, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly in opposition to the Davis-Bacon proposal in the legislation under consideration at the present. Certainly I am not opposed to a workman making a decent wage; but in legislation of this type, I do not believe that the Federal Government should prescribe to the individual States the prevailing wage rate to be paid for the construction and improvement of the highways within that State, whether they be a part of the interstate system or not. Therefore it is my hope that somehow, somehow, this provision can be stricken from the bill.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that closer scrutiny could be given to the tax features of the bill. It appears that there are certain inequities in the bill as it has been presented to us; although I agree with the pay-as-you-go idea as set forth in the legislation.

I am including a number of telegrams I have received, Mr. Speaker, each asking that I do what I can to either defeat or support certain provisions of this legislation. A glance at these telegrams will show the predicament that virtually every Member in this body is in at the present time and it may point to the fact that there is need for further study and additional deliberation on the tax features of the legislation under consideration.

AUSTIN, TEX., July 25, 1955.

HON. OLIN TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As executive director of the Organized Trucking Industry of Texas, representing some 1,200 commercial motor vehicle operators, I want to confirm this industry's feeling that a Federal highway program is imperative at this session. Our only concern is that it is equitably financed. We feel that Representative TOM STEED's compromise plan will do the job and is a road program we can live with as well. I hope you can give such a plan your active support.

JIM TAYLOR,
Executive Director, Texas Motor
Transportation Association.

AUSTIN, TEX., July 21, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Texas Good Roads Association holds it imperative that the Fallon bill up for floor consideration be passed and that quickly. It would be tragic and disastrous if the Federal Congress failed to make available in the 84th regular session moneys to finance an expanded, modernized, and integrated highway construction program. We urge you to work diligently and enthusiastically for the

passage of this bill. Any tax bill always runs the gauntlet of protest and opposition. Every affected industry has had an opportunity to present its viewpoint and spell out alleged inequities and unwise provisions. We frankly are greatly concerned by the inclusion of the utilities section and the Bacon-Davis section which we think will compound hurtful provisions. We know all legislation is based on compromise and seldom reflects all provisions which one thinks beneficial and sound but we do insist we have to get a bill through this session in the interests of a sound national economy, national defense, and certainly in the interest of safety and convenience of the motoring public. We are hopeful that it will not vitiate sound established principles of governmental practice. To that end we urge your unending support of the bill with rule changes which will permit consideration of wise amendments. Time is of the essence. Good citizenship requires that no consideration operates as a road block to bar the final adoption of the Fallon bill with essential amendments to make it acceptable to the Senate.

IKE ASHBURN,
Texas Good Roads Association.

TRANS-TEXAS AIRWAYS,
Houston, Tex., July 20, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: It is my understanding that the House Public Works Committee has reported out favorably highway bill H. R. 7072 which proposes to finance a highway program through a series of tax increases, including a 1-cent increase in tax on gasoline. The committee approved an exemption for nonhighway users from such increased gasoline tax which includes aviation use.

On behalf of Trans-Texas Airways, I urge your support of such exemption for non-highway purposes in view of the fact that the gasoline tax provisions in this bill are obviously intended to provide revenue from highway users for an expanded highway construction program and that the imposition of an increase of tax on gasoline used for nonhighway purposes would be inequitable.

We sincerely request that you will support the bill as it now exempts nonhighway users from the proposed increased gasoline tax.

Cordially yours,

TRANS-TEXAS AIRWAYS,
JACK K. AYER,
Executive Assistant to the President.

AUSTIN, TEX., July 22, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We would appreciate your best efforts in seeing the utility provision struck from the highway bill. We consider this an invasion of States rights and conflicting with contracts now existing between the States and utilities companies.

TEXAS HIGHWAY BRANCH ASSOCIATED
GENERAL CONTRACTORS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 22, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Trucking Associations is vigorously supporting the national-defense highway program. It was the first taxpaying group to express at congressional hearings on May 12 and again on July 11, its willingness to pay tax increases to support the program, our objections are directed to those revenue provisions in section 4 of H. R. 7474, which call for a higher rate of tax on diesel fuel than on gasoline and a higher tax rate

for truck tires, tubes, and tire recapping material than on other tires, tubes, and tire-recapping material. This does not mean we object to trucks paying more than automobiles. The same rate of tax for cars and trucks produces enormously greater tax payments per truck than per car.

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS,
INC.,
NEIL J. CURRY, President,
JOHN V. LAWRENCE,
Managing Director.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., July 19, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives, Congress of the
the United States, Washington, D. C.:

City transit companies are now paying more than their just portion of gasoline and diesel fuel tax to build State and Federal highways upon which they are not licensed to operate while paying to the municipalities a tax for use of city streets. Texas State 54th legislature recognized this and gave Texas transit some relief by amending house bill 660 to exempt city transit companies from additional State fuel tax. Urge that you adopt similar amendment exempting urban transit from all additional taxes proposed in H. R. 7072 to allow us to continue this necessary operation under private ownership.

B. GORDON FORSYTH,
Chairman, Texas Transit Association;
Vice President, Nueces
Transportation Co.

DALLAS, TEX., July 20, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Washington, D. C.:

Last night House Public Works Committee under heavy labor pressure voted to include Davis-Bacon provision in highway bill substantially like section 11, Fallon bill, H. R. 7072. We wish to voice our objections to this section and particularly the need for a thorough investigation of the Davis-Bacon law and its operations by the House Labor Committee before it is extended into these new areas heretofore reserved to the States. It has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and has been used to raise labor standards insofar as wages are concerned on public works by means never intended under the law. All of this has been at the taxpayers' expense with the help and support of political allies of organized labor who are located in key spots in Government service. We ask that you make a valiant fight on the floor and vote against the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision in the House Public Works Committee Highway bill.

F. S. OLDT,
National Director, Association of
General Contractors of America.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Passage of H. R. 7072, a bill at levying additional unfair taxes against the trucking industry, would be a serious blow to these businesses which already carry more than their share of the tax load. Strongly urge that you vote no to this vicious legislation.

J. T. CALNON.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge that you vote no to H. R. 7072 which poses a serious threat to trucking industry. Passage of this unfair measure would force many of the Nation's truckers, who already carry a heavy tax load, out of business. Such action would seriously damage the Nation's economy.

KEN W. DAVIS.

AUSTIN, TEX., July 6, 1955.

HON. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Public and private utilities including the nearly 300 independent telephone companies throughout Texas are anxious to obtain passage of the reimbursement provisions of the Federal Highway Relocation Aid bill. Unless the provisions of the Gore bill are substantially followed discrimination against utilities will increase the cost of service in the future and will operate to force location of utilities away from public rights-of-way thereby increasing the cost of and reduce the efficiency of maintenance as well as increase cost due to relocation expense. Some utilities already enjoy such immunity. We feel sure when you consider the overall situation that you will be satisfied to support this legislation.

TEXAS TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
J. B. HALEY, Executive Secretary.

FORT WORTH, TEX., July 1, 1955.

HON. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We are advised House of Representatives intends to take up H. R. 7072 for final passage before adjournment. This is the Federal highway bill with provisions added for raising revenue through increase in Federal gasoline tax from 2 to 3 cents and Diesel from 2 to 6 cents and excise taxes on tires and tubes size 920 or over and weighing 90 pounds or over from 5 and 9 cents, respectively, to 50 cents per pound. These increases will yield about \$850 million per year with large vehicles paying about half of it, although they are only a fraction of the total motor vehicles. This would cost Greyhound an amount equivalent to 20 percent of its entire 1954 net income before taxes. We are unalterably opposed to the bill because of its confiscatory impact on the motor-bus industry. In any event the measure should not be taken up without first affording to those affected a full public hearing before the proper congressional committee. We urge you to assist us in postponing consideration of the bill until such time as the committee can hear all of the facts with reference to this measure.

E. F. FREEMAN,
President, Southwestern Greyhound
Lines, Inc.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., July 7, 1955.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your opposition to H. R. 7072 which adds \$2,000 per year to already-taxed trucks.

JOE F. HALL,
HALL OIL CO.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. All time has expired.

The Chair desires to make a statement: Under the rule no amendments are in order to section 4 of the pending bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but shall not be subject to amendment, and except it shall be in order to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 7494.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39

Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$725 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$326,250,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$217,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

(c) \$181,250,000 for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 833).

Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State until June 30, 1959, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for improvement of specific projects as provided in this act, and prior acts.

Recognizing it to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the construction of a safe and efficient system of Federal-aid highways in each State, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the annual sums heretofore authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas, by amounts which in each year shall provide an increase over the immediately preceding year of not less than \$25 million, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, as hereinbefore provided, and continuing such progression in each of the succeeding fiscal years, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for which funds may hereafter be authorized. It is further the intent to allocate the total funds thus provided to the three categories in the same relative ratio as hereinbefore provided for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas.

It is further declared to be the intent of Congress to continue during the life of this act the authorizations for roads in the Federal domain at annual rates not less than those contained in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350, 83d Cong.).

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wilson of Indiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual procedure one must go through in order to get to speak briefly on a bill of this importance. In this stampede to get out of here the committee would ram a \$48 billion tax bill down the throats of the country. Let me tell you that it is not going to be popular. If you think it is, wait until you go home.

I want to offer a few figures here for the benefit of some of the Members. I want to let you know how many truck drivers and owners there are opposed to this bill in the State of Indiana. I am going to take 1 congressional district of Indiana—and that district is not the

largest or the most heavily populated—where they have 25,743 truck registrations. The value of those trucks is \$28,317,000. They employ 19,977 people, with a payroll of some \$82 million a year. They are not going to be very happy about this bill, especially since they have not had a chance to be heard on the merits of the bill.

If the bill is so good, why did not the committee that sponsors it give more vitally interested people an opportunity to testify? I was given 3 minutes. I have been fighting this bill a long time, yet I was given only 3 minutes to explain my position.

More than 100,000 hogs are sold every year at the Producers Market Association stockyards near one important Indiana city. Trucks run daily, hauling 75 percent to the eastern markets, usually to New Jersey and Pittsburgh.

Who is going to pay the extra cost this bill would impose on the trucking industry? Why, of course, the consumers. It is going to be passed on. The trucking people cannot stand it all. Members of this body had better take a second look at the people who operate the trucks back home and those who will be affected by a hike in trucking charges.

And then there are the farmers who are going to have to be checked and questioned about the 1-cent refund on fuel tax he is supposed to get, under this bill. He will find he has to pay 3 cents Federal gasoline tax and he is going to wonder why only 1 cent is refunded. Why, if he can get the 1 cent back, can he not get the other 2 cents? If you think these farmers are plumb crazy you are absolutely wrong. The farmers are getting pretty smart and they are going to remember this thing when the time comes.

This is the worst bill, the worst procedure I have ever seen in the 15 years I have been a Member of Congress. I happen to be the only Republican ever elected from my congressional district in Indiana. I have been here 15 years and if I look after my people and their interests I will be here a long time more.

But, if I help to ram this bill down their throats and take a long vacation and get my salary increased \$7,200 a year and go off fishing and say "to heck with them," they will not send me back, and I would not blame them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"Short title

"SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the 'National Interstate Highway Act.'

"Objective and policy

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the development of a modern, adequate, safe, and efficient system of highways deemed essential for the expansion of the economy and the changing concepts of the military and

civil defense of the United States. It is further declared to be desirable that the development of such system of highways be continued through the cooperation and joint efforts of the Federal Government, the States, and local subdivisions thereof. It is hereby found that those essential highways are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national and civil defense, and that the most important portion of such highways are, or should be, located on the National System of Interstate Highways.

Accordingly, it is the objective of this act to complete the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways within the next 10 years up to such standards as will produce safe highways adequate to handle traffic needs for at least the next 20 years. This objective will be reached only by means of a program which will presently assure the financing of the system as a whole, and provide for prompt acquisition of necessary rights-of-way. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to continue or to impose such taxes as may be necessary to meet this objective.

"SEC. 3. This act is divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents:

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Title I—Federal Highway Corporation

- "Sec. 101. Creation of Corporation.
- Sec. 102. Management of Corporation.
- Sec. 103. Duty of Corporation.
- Sec. 104. Corporate powers.
- Sec. 105. Corporate financing.
- Sec. 106. Services and facilities of other agencies.
- Sec. 107. Misappropriation of funds.
- Sec. 108. Report to Congress.

"Title II—Concerning the Department of Commerce

- "Sec. 201. Cancellation of authorizations.
- Sec. 202. Interstate system.
- Sec. 203. Standards.
- Sec. 204. Expenditure authorization.
- Sec. 205. Distribution by States.
- Sec. 206. Scheduling of construction and participation by States.
- Sec. 207. Right-of-way acquisition.

"Title III—Miscellaneous

- "Sec. 301. Definitions.
- Sec. 302. Without compensation employees.
- Sec. 303. Amendment to Corporation Control Act.
- Sec. 304. Construction of this act.
- Sec. 305. Effect on present law.

"TITLE I—INTERSTATE HIGHWAY FINANCE CORPORATION

"Creation of Corporation

"SEC. 101. There is hereby created, subject to the direction and supervision of the President, a body corporate to be known as the Interstate Highway Finance Corporation. As hereafter provided in section 303, the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia.

"Management of Corporation

"SEC. 102. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') composed of four members. One of these members shall be a full-time public member appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, without regard to political party affiliation, and the President shall designate such full-time public member as Chairman of the Board. The three remaining members shall be the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter called 'Secretary'), the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Defense, or their representatives. The Commissioner of Public Roads shall serve as executive secretary of the Board.

"(b) The Chairman of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per annum. As Chairman, he shall preside at meetings of the Board and be the Corporation's chief representative. He shall be responsible for general supervision of the activities of the staff of the Corporation. He shall also maintain liaison with the representatives of the States with respect to the policies set forth in this act. The Chairman in the conduct of his functions as Chairman shall act in conformance with determinations of the Board.

"Duty of Corporation"

"SEC. 103. It shall be the duty of the Corporation (a) to receive and borrow funds, (b) to provide and make available to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to permit him to make the payments or advances to the States, through the established channels of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal share of the cost of construction of projects on the interstate system, and such other costs or expenses as are permitted or required to be paid or advanced by him in connection with the interstate system under the terms of this act, and (c) to perform such other duties as may be required in the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers under this act.

"Corporate powers"

"SEC. 104. For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this act, the Corporation—

"(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

"(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

"(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

"(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal by-laws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its functions may be carried out and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

"(5) may make and carry out such contracts, agreements, or other transactions as it may deem necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business;

"(6) may incur indebtedness as provided in section 105, and incur current obligations incidental to performing its functions, subject to provisions of law applicable to Government corporations;

"(7) may appoint such officers, agents, attorneys, and employees as it deems necessary for the conduct of its affairs, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds;

"(8) may utilize the available services and facilities of other agencies as provided in section 106;

"(9) may use the United States mails in the same manner as its executive departments; and

"(10) may take such actions and exercise such other powers as may be necessary, incidental or appropriate to carry out the function of the Corporation, and to further the objectives of this act.

"Corporate financing"

"SEC. 105. (a) The Corporation is authorized to issue, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, obligations in an amount not to exceed \$21 billion. Obligations issued under this subsection shall have such maturities, not to exceed 30 years, and shall bear such rate or rates of interest, as may be determined by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and they shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. The aggregate amount of obligations under this subsection out-

standing at any one time shall not exceed the maximum amount of obligations, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of July 1 of each year, on which the annual principal and interest payments required over the life of the obligations can be made from prospective appropriations under subsection (b) and other revenues of the Corporation, but obligations lawfully issued hereunder will not be affected by determinations subsequent to date of issue. The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Corporation. The Corporation is authorized to purchase in the open market for retirement, at any time and at any price, any outstanding obligations issued under this subsection.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1956, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of \$622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Director of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program. The Secretary of the Treasury shall enter into a contract with the Corporation providing for the payment of such amounts to the Corporation, which contract shall stand as security for the outstanding obligations of the Corporation, it being the intent of Congress that such amounts shall be dedicated to the construction of the Interstate System. The Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the Corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriations for that fiscal year, such advances to be repaid from amounts subsequently appropriated hereunder in that fiscal year. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, an amount for each fiscal year that bears the same ratio to the estimated costs of collecting taxes, refunds of taxes, and costs of making refunds of taxes under section 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for that fiscal year as the appropriation hereunder bears to the estimated total revenue collected under those provisions for that fiscal year.

"(c) The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its obligations in an amount not to exceed in any 1 year the amount necessary above all other revenues of the Corporation to provide for debt service of the Corporation during that year but not to exceed the aggregate amount of \$5 billion outstanding at any one time. The obligations issued by the Corporation under this subsection shall have such maturities as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation

to be issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

"(d) All obligations issued by the Corporation shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under authority and control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof.

"(e) The penultimate sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by inserting after the phrase "or obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association," the phrase "or obligations of the Interstate Highway Finance Corporation."

"(f) All revenues of the Corporation, including moneys appropriated under subsection (b) of this section shall be maintained as a trust fund.

"Services and facilities of other agencies"

"SEC. 106. (a) Except as specifically authorized by the President, the Corporation shall, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the services of the officers, employees, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States, except that any such agency having custody of any data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, upon the request of the Corporation, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

"(b) The Corporation shall contribute to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to the Corporation's employees and their beneficiaries. The Corporation shall also contribute to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the Corporation's employees. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Corporation into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Misappropriation of funds"

"SEC. 107. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, or conversion, of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation.

"(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"Report to the Congress"

"SEC. 108. The Board shall prepare an annual report of operations under this act for transmittal by the President to the Congress.

"TITLE II—PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"Cancellation of authorizations

"SEC. 201. (a) Section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby amended by reducing the authorization for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956 and 1957, from '\$175 million' to '\$75 million.'

"Interstate system

"SEC. 202. In furtherance of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, the Secretary is authorized, within the limitation of 40,000 miles, to approve as part of the interstate system such lateral feeder and distributing routes, and circumferential routes as may be required to furnish maximum utility of the system within or adjacent to urban areas, provided that one or both ends of such routes shall lie on a route of the system. The Secretary is further authorized to approve as part of the interstate system any highway which complies with the standards of section 203 and which lies on an approved route of the interstate system irrespective as to whether or not tolls are collected for the use thereof. The Secretary is authorized, in cooperation with the State highway departments, to designate as promptly as reasonable possible routes to take up the mileage still undersigned so that the entire 40,000 miles of this system shall be designated. In approving any undesignated mileage the Secretary shall designate those routes which contribute most to the benefit of the system as a whole and are most important from the point of view of national defense. In case the actual construction of highways on the system increases available undesignated mileage the Secretary may redesignate this mileage in accordance with the preceding sentence. No additional mileage shall be placed on the system until the Secretary shall certify that 80 percent of the mileage originally designated has been improved to the approved standards.

"Standards

"SEC. 203. (a) The standards to be used for the interstate system shall be those approved by the Secretary after consultation with the Department of Defense, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the State highway departments. The Secretary is authorized to make the final determination of the standards to be used, except as provided in section 102 (d).

"(b) The geometric standards for the interstate system shall be such standards as are deemed adequate to properly accommodate the types and volume of traffic forecast for the 20 years immediately following enactment of this act. Such standards shall provide for the development of a system as nationally uniform in characteristics as possible within a 10-year construction period.

"(c) The right-of-way width on the interstate system shall be adequate to permit construction of the route to the geometric standards provided for in subparagraph (b) for a period of at least 20 years following the date of authorization of a project under this act. Such width shall not be deemed adequate if (1) it does not include provision for the addition of more traffic lanes at a future date, except that the maximum width in any case need not exceed that necessary for three moving lanes in each direction, plus service roads as necessary; and if (2) it does not contain the proper and necessary degree and type of control of access or exits from the highway which will permit maximum freedom of traffic flow and promote national safety.

"(d) The standards shall be periodically reviewed by the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate State and Federal of-

ficials, to insure maximum utility of the completed system with due recognition to the desirability of developing a national system having the greatest uniformity of characteristics possible.

"Expenditure authorization

"SEC. 204. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make payments in an amount not to exceed \$25 billion or such lesser sum as estimated by the Corporation on the basis of prospective revenues to be the maximum amount to be available for the purposes of this act.

"Distribution by States

"SEC. 205. (a) All sums herein authorized shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with needs of the interstate system in the several States as determined in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the following amounts (representing 90 percent of the needs of the several States with respect to the interstate system, as reported in House Document No. 120, 84th Cong., 1st sess.), shall be distributed to the States as next hereinbelow set forth:

[Amounts in thousands]

State	10 years	Annually
Alabama.....	\$328,811	\$32,881
Arizona.....	188,622	18,862
Arkansas.....	182,776	18,278
California.....	2,089,397	208,940
Colorado.....	140,752	14,075
Connecticut.....	499,500	49,950
Delaware.....	59,330	5,933
Florida.....	445,622	44,562
Georgia.....	629,921	62,992
Idaho.....	96,292	9,629
Illinois.....	958,212	95,821
Indiana.....	780,526	78,053
Iowa.....	245,153	24,515
Kansas.....	165,779	16,578
Kentucky.....	442,809	44,280
Louisiana.....	443,272	44,327
Maine.....	132,549	13,255
Maryland.....	390,730	39,073
Massachusetts.....	754,179	75,418
Michigan.....	1,166,141	116,614
Minnesota.....	434,781	43,478
Mississippi.....	221,252	22,125
Missouri.....	538,728	53,873
Montana.....	137,038	13,704
Nebraska.....	96,034	9,603
Nevada.....	66,166	6,611
New Hampshire.....	59,785	5,979
New Jersey.....	1,221,407	122,141
New Mexico.....	212,141	21,214
New York.....	1,202,310	120,231
North Carolina.....	222,215	22,222
North Dakota.....	96,161	9,616
Ohio.....	1,224,656	122,466
Oklahoma.....	339,274	33,927
Oregon.....	287,460	28,746
Pennsylvania.....	684,019	68,402
Rhode Island.....	110,582	11,058
South Carolina.....	164,953	16,495
South Dakota.....	85,576	8,558
Tennessee.....	341,855	34,186
Texas.....	784,814	78,481
Utah.....	214,418	21,442
Vermont.....	159,601	15,960
Virginia.....	512,514	51,251
Washington.....	420,742	42,074
West Virginia.....	232,726	23,273
Wisconsin.....	290,158	29,016
Wyoming.....	266,251	26,625
District of Columbia.....	136,621	13,662

Provided, That the Secretary shall, in cooperation with the several States, reevaluate the remaining needs of the interstate system in the several States in 1958, 1961, and 1964, and shall render a written report to the Congress on or before the 1st day of February in each of such years containing the results of such reevaluation and his recommendations with reference to any proposed changes in the distribution of the balance of the funds apportioned in the foregoing table: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available hereunder shall be 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, indi-

vidual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area; *And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

"(b) On or before April 1, 1956, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement, and an estimate of the cost as of January 1, 1956, of bringing that portion of the designated interstate mileage within its boundaries up to the standards prescribed under this act. On or before April 1 of each subsequent year, each State shall submit a revised estimate of such cost as of January 1 of such year, including therein the actual or estimated cost of any construction of such mileage begun or carried on subsequent to January 1, 1956.

"(c) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall establish an approved estimate of cost for construction of projects on the interstate system in each State, and the Secretary shall in accordance with needs and subject to the provisions of section 205 (a), determine the ratio of the approved estimate of cost for each State to the total of the approved estimates of such costs for all States.

"Scheduling of construction and participation by States

"SEC. 206. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, and on or before April 1 of each year thereafter, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement and an estimate of the cost of projects it proposes to construct during each of the next two fiscal years. The Secretary shall examine these estimates, and before the beginning of each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year 1956, he shall establish an approved construction program, including the estimated cost thereof, for each State for such fiscal year.

"(b) The Secretary shall make allocations to the States in the amounts of the approved estimates, and the Secretary shall promptly notify the States of the approved construction programs and of the amounts so allocated. These allocations shall be available for obligation by the States to which allocated for a period of 2 years. Any sums not under obligation at the end of any 2-year period may be reallocated, as the Secretary may determine.

"(c) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Corporation a schedule indicating his best estimate of the cash requirements necessary to meet payments during the next 2 fiscal years. These estimates shall include estimates of amounts needed for payments under section 207, for research as authorized by section 10 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and for administrative purposes in an amount not exceeding one-tenth of 1 percent of the funds made available by the Corporation in any fiscal year. The Corporation shall promptly make available funds to the Secretary as required by his annual estimate.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to advance funds to each State to permit prompt payment of construction costs.

"(e) Payments to the States made pursuant to this section shall be subject to the conditions (1) that construction of projects on the interstate system in each State shall be in accordance with the standards approved by the Secretary; (2) that the State participates in the costs of construction in each fiscal year in the matching amount provided for such State under the terms of section 205 (a); and (3) that the State will have the same obligations as to maintenance of the projects constructed under this act that it has under Federal-aid highway legislation.

"Right-of-way acquisition"

"SEC. 207. (a) If the Secretary shall determine that the State highway department of any State is unable to obtain possession and the right to enter upon and use the rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands, improved or unimproved, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, required for any project on the interstate system with sufficient promptness, and each such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands, or such lesser percentage as may be applicable under the provisions of section 205 (a), the Secretary is authorized, upon the request of such a State, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General, and in the name of the United States, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such rights-of-way, lands or interests in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), and to expend funds for projects thereon. The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interest in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations. The cost incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition; and shall be payable out of the funds apportioned to the State hereunder available to the Secretary for construction of projects on the interstate system. The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such rights-of-way, lands, or interest in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or to such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

"(b) Whenever rights-of-way on the interstate system are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection.

"(c) The Secretary may adopt such regulations as he deems advisable to protect fully the interests of the United States in the acquisition of rights-of-way. He may take such action as necessary to carry out such regulations.

*"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS"**"Definitions"*

"SEC. 301. As used in this act, unless the context requires otherwise—

"(a) The term 'interstate system' means the National System of Interstate Highways as authorized to be designated by section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, and includes those routes heretofore designated by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, as well as routes to be hereafter designated. The mileage so designated as of June 30, 1954, is 37,600 miles. The mileage of the routes so designated is calculated by

stating the mileage of the most traveled highway between control points. The mileage of the entire system is limited to 40,000 miles.

"(b) The term 'Corporation' means the Interstate Highway Finance Corporation created by title I of this act.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Commerce.

"(d) The term 'Federal-aid highway legislation' means 'the act providing that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads and for other purposes,' approved June 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented.

"Amendment to Corporation Control Act"

"SEC. 302. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the words 'Federal Highway Corporation.'

"Construction of this act"

"SEC. 303. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

"Effect on present law"

"SEC. 304. All provisions of Federal-aid highway legislation shall remain in full force and effect, and shall apply to the required actions to be taken, and payments to be made, by the Secretary under this act in connection with the interstate system with the same force and effect that said provisions of the said legislation applied to such actions and payments in connection with the interstate system prior to the passage of this act, except that the provisions of this act shall supersede any provision of the said legislation which conflicts with a provision of this act, except that section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to the interstate system, and for the purposes of section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment."

Mr. FALLON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object except to say that the amendment which I have offered is the Clay report bill so that the House will understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as I said at the beginning of the debate on this legislation, this is perhaps the largest legislative proposal for the building of highways ever offered by any civilized government in the history of the world. It is not a \$48 billion program on the part of the Federal Government

either under the Clay bill or under the Fallon bill. The Fallon bill proposes \$24 billion in taxes, the Clay bill \$21 billion in bonds.

Now, much has been said in regard to the payment of the interest that might accrue on these bonds. To begin with, the people to whom that interest will be paid will pay back to the Federal Government a considerable share of it in income taxes.

There has been criticism here this afternoon that the roads will be worn out before the bonds are paid. Let me say certainly the rights-of-way will not wear out; neither will the foundations of the roads wear out. The top may wear out as it does on all other roads. I am reminded of the building of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, which was nearly 20 years ago. It is true that in some places they have been compelled to blacktop it, but that is all. In addition to that, if it becomes necessary, whether it is built under this bill or the Fallon bill, let us remind ourselves and be aware of the fact that the maintenance and repair of these roads is the responsibility of the States and not of the Federal Government. I am sure the States will not expend money where it is not necessary, and I do not think anybody need fear that the roads will wear out before the bonds are paid.

It has been pointed out that there will be great savings to the people of this country, if we provide a more adequate system of highways. Not only will there be a great saving of life, estimated at more than 10 percent—I hope it is more—but also a saving in the destruction of property upon the highways of the Nation today which amounts to the staggering sum of approximately \$4 billion. If we save even a quarter or half of that, plus the saving of life, that is justification enough for the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to provide better and more adequate highways.

I want to repeat, so no one will misunderstand, that the bill which I have introduced is the same as the original Clay bill that was introduced back in January-February of this year, with one exception and with a few minor amendments.

The Bacon-Davis provision is not in the bill which I introduced. Neither is there a provision for payment to utilities for the relocation of their facilities. A provision that was in the original bill provided for payment to the States for roads already built, and that has been omitted from this bill. Those are the main features. Otherwise, the rest of the bill remains practically the same. The financing provision is the same. I am sure that everyone understands what my bill contains even though it was not read in full. I was in complete accord with the motion made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] who has been helpful and cooperative in presenting legislation for highways, and a wonderful acting chairman of the committee.

So, as we come to a vote on this bill, let everybody understand what it is, so that no mistakes will be made. Now that Members have a choice, 1 of 2 things will be done; either they will vote for

the financing of the highway program over a period of 30 years, through the issuance of bonds, or they will vote for the Fallon bill which provides for the imposition of taxes. In either case, there is a choice offered and an opportunity for the House to express its judgment in connection with the greatest road program ever presented to the United States Congress.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that all during the hearings and conferences the ranking Member on the Republican side has been of very great help and a steady influence. We do not differ in any way on this highway program except on the financial section. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and I have worked together on road programs for the past 10 years, and at no time have we ever differed on the need for road legislation that came before the House.

The reason why we shifted our attention from the Clay bill or the Dondero bill is the fact that the other body took such positive action against it. It is true that we should not always be influenced by the judgment or actions of the other body. But as a practical matter we had to take this action into consideration. If there is to be any chance of a highway bill this year, it certainly cannot be the Dondero bill, because if we were to go into conference with two different philosophies, there would be little possibility of an agreement. I think we have got to find some legislation close to the provisions of the bill from the other body. That was the main reason why this bill was voted down by the Committee on Public Works.

Another reason was there would be \$11,500,000,000 in interest, which would make this road program cost \$11,500,000,000 more than it would cost under H. R. 7474. That is a fact. There is no way of dodging it. It would cost \$11,500,000,000 more.

So we must decide here today whether we want to pay for these roads in 15 years in cash and no interest charges or whether we want to pay for them over a period of 30 years on credit with huge interest costs.

The fact is, at the end of 15 years, we will be able to say to the next generation, "Here is something that is paid for."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There seems to be some confusion on the utilities question. Is it possible for any utility to get any reimbursement unless the respective State highway commission recommends it?

Mr. FALLON. Under the basic law, the Bureau of Public Roads cannot honor anything coming from anybody except the State highway commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the State highway commission must recommend it before any reimbursement can be made?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the present law, if a particular utility wanted to apply for these benefits, and have the State reimburse them, is it not true that the Federal Government would participate in the relocation cost of the utility?

Mr. FALLON. At the present time, yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. So why is it necessary to have any section at all in here about that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. This even limits it. This is 2 percent and half of the cost.

Mr. FALLON. This limits it to 50 percent of the cost and 2 percent of the cost of the project.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does anybody believe that a State highway commission would not recommend that the Federal Government pay the 50 percent if the law authorized the Federal Government to do so? The State would not do it if it had to use only its own money, but is not the State highway commission likely to say, "Sure, go ahead, if the Federal Government will pay it, it is fine."

Mr. FALLON. The State is allowed to do it now and the Federal Government picks up the check for 100 percent. Under this amendment it can pick up the check only for 50 percent, and only when recommended by the highway commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the State recommends it, the State puts up half and the Government puts up half. It does not take it from the Federal Government.

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Dondero substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 20, line 16, renumber section 207 as section 208 and add a new section 207 as follows:

"Labor standards

"SEC. 207. The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial work performed on highway projects in the National System of Interstate Highways authorized by this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276-a)."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Will the gentleman explain whether this is the same amendment as now contained in the Fallon bill?

Mr. MACK of Washington. This is the same amendment that is contained in the Fallon bill.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Davis-Bacon provision was put into the Fallon bill by a vote of 28 to 4. In short, almost all of the Republicans and nearly all of the Democrats on the committee are in favor of the Davis-Bacon provision.

The Davis-Bacon provision is an old law in the United States. It has been on the statute books for 25 years, since 1931. The authors of the Davis-Bacon law when enacted in 1931 were the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Davis, who was at one time Secretary of Labor in a Republican administration, and Mr. Bacon, a Representative from the State of New York. Mr. Bacon, a Representative of our State of New York, I am told was a very wealthy man and a very conservative man. The circumstance which led Mr. Bacon to propose the Davis-Bacon bill was that the Veterans' Administration was engaged in building a veterans' hospital in his district in New York State.

The contractor who had the lowest bid was from outside of the State of New York. He brought in a crew of a thousand workers from a low-wage area and built barracks in which to house this crew, messhalls in which to feed his workers, and opened a company store in which to sell these workers goods. This aroused the opposition of the business people of the community; it aroused the opposition of the contractors in the State of New York, and it aroused the opposition of labor. As a result, Congress in the Hoover administration, a Republican administration, in 1931 enacted this law in order to protect workers against this type of unfair competition.

The Davis-Bacon law, now on the statute books for a quarter of a century, is in force on many types of public works.

The Davis-Bacon law today applies wherever Federal money is employed to build airports, to construct schools, to carry out slum clearance, to build Federal hospitals. It applies to the lease-purchase program of public buildings enacted last year by the 83d Republican Congress.

The Davis-Bacon law requirements are in force even where the Federal Government pays all of the cost to construct such roads as forest roads and Park Service roads.

I, by my amendment, am asking that this Davis-Bacon law apply to the interstate highways that are to be built under this bill and toward the cost of which the Federal Government will provide 90 to 95 percent of all the money used to build them.

If it is right to have the Davis-Bacon provision in the highway act and in force where the Federal Government provides all the money, certainly there is nothing wrong to enforcing the Davis-Bacon law where the Federal Government puts up 90 percent to 95 percent of the money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As one who introduced the Clay bill as an amendment, I certainly have no objection to your proposal.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish at this time to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack]. I hope very much the committee will adopt his amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I know the gentleman from California had a similar amendment ready to offer and would have offered it had he had an opportunity.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I want to commend the gentleman from Washington for offering this amendment, and I will join in supporting the amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the highway program proposed by this bill authorizes the spending of \$48½ billion during the next 15 years for the construction of new highways. This will be the greatest public works program in the history of mankind. The money provided in this legislation would build the equivalent of 140 Panama Canals—the Panama Canal cost \$360 million to build. No building program of such colossal magnitude heretofore has ever been undertaken.

To carry out this program great companies will organize construction crews and then bid on the thousands of highway projects to be let.

The Government, under law, must accept the lowest bids for these jobs. What I seek to safeguard against through the Davis-Bacon provision is that companies which organize construction crews in low wage areas shall not be permitted to bring low paid crews into States and areas where wages are higher and thereby break down wage rates where good wage rates now prevail.

We do not want contractors to get contracts based on their ability to hire labor cheaply. We want them to compete on a basis of ability, competency and efficiency, not on low wages. The Federal Government should not be a party to encouraging the breaking down of wage standards in any area where good wages prevail. That is why the protection of the Davis-Bacon law is needed in this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the so-called Clay bill as introduced by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. Dondero]. I am opposed to the Fallon bill primarily because I oppose its discriminatory tax provisions. A howl of protest followed this attempt by the Public Works Committee to usurp the Ways and Means Committee's jurisdiction and include unequal and unfair taxes in the bill. But why these taxes at all? In our expanding economy the present taxes on gasoline will pay off a bond issue. All local financing is done that way. Suffice to say that with the estimated net increase of 3 million cars annually traveling our highways the administration's original proposal to finance the cost by issuing bonds is absolutely practical in my judgment.

The only reservation I make in support of the Clay bill is that this Davis-Bacon provision must be included. The inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision is absolutely essential to the maintenance of living standards in the State of Washington, with particular reference to my district of Seattle and Kitsap County. My area is a high-cost-of-living area, and prevailing wage rates must be maintained if labor in my district is to hold the wage scales necessary to the maintenance of proper living standards under these high-cost conditions. We have had occasions in the past when outside contractors with out-of-area labor came in and undercut local labor markets. I am unalterably opposed to the repetition of such a situation. Consequently, I am supporting the Clay bill, with the intention of supporting an amendment providing the Davis-Bacon wage provision when it is offered.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. As a member of the committee, I join the gentleman from Washington in supporting his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I was happy to hear the ranking minority Member say that he had no opposition to this amendment. I think it greatly improves the substitute amendment, and I hope the amendment will be adopted and that the substitute will be adopted.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The committee voted for it 28 to 4.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Washington for offering his amendment, and I shall support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Strike out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 7474 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$725 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(a) \$326,250,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(b) \$217,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

"(c) \$181,250,000 for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

"The sums authorized by this section shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

"Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State until June 30, 1959, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for improvement of specific projects as provided in this act, and prior acts.

"Recognizing it to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the construction of a safe and efficient system of Federal-aid highways in each State, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the annual sums heretofore authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas, by amounts which in each year shall provide an increase over the immediately preceding year of not less than \$25 million, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, as hereinbefore provided, and continuing such progression in each of the succeeding fiscal years, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for which funds may hereafter be authorized. It is further the intent to allocate the total funds thus provided to the three categories in the same relative ratio as hereinbefore provided for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas.

"It is further declared to be the intent of Congress to continue during the life of this act the authorizations for roads in the Federal domain at annual rates not less than those contained in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350, 83d Cong.).

"Sec. 2. (a) For national defense and other purposes, it is considered essential to provide for the early completion of a national system of interstate and defense highways, which system shall be understood to mean a system of highways of primary importance to the national defense and economy and welfare of the Nation, and shall be the system referred to as the National System of Interstate Highways, authorized in section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act is hereby amended to substitute the term 'National System of Interstate and Defense Highways' for the term 'National System of Interstate Highways' wherever that term appears in that act or any other acts. When used hereinafter in the term 'National System' shall be understood to mean the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways described above.

"(b) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the national system, including extensions, spurs, and distributing connectors thereof through, within and into urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and an additional like amount for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the national system in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the national system in all of the States and the District of Columbia as set forth in the computations compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable

on account of any project on the national system provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

"(c) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sum apportioned to the State for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

"(d) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (c) of this section shall lapse.

"(e) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State or regulations established by appropriate State authority effective on March 1, 1956, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled 'Policy Concerning Maximum Dimensions, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States' and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned, in the same manner as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the lawful operation over the public highways within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be operated lawfully over the public highways within such State on March 1, 1956.

"(f) The Secretary is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway systems and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1958, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights.

"Sec. 3. Not more than 20 percent of the respective amounts apportioned to a State for any fiscal year from funds made available for expenditure under clause (a), clause

(b), or clause (c) of the first section, or from funds authorized to be appropriated under section 2, may be transferred to the apportionment made to such State under any other of such clauses or under such section, except that no such apportionment may be increased by more than 20 percent by reason of transfers to it under this section: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available by transfer under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs thereof, including the costs of rights-of-way, except that in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of the total area: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds which may be hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

"Sec. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including, within the term 'interests in lands', the control of access thereto from adjoining lands) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

"(1) the Secretary has determined either that such State is unable to acquire necessary interests in lands, or is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

"(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands.

"The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

"(b) The costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the National System apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired and any sums paid to the Secretary by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways or shall be deducted from other moneys due the State for reimburse-

ment under section 2 of this act and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System.

"(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to such lands or interest in lands as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

"(d) Whenever rights-of-way on the National System are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection.

"Sec. 5. (a) For the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way in the most expeditious and economical manner and recognizing that the acquisition of rights-of-way requires lengthy planning and negotiations if it is to be done at a reasonable cost, the Secretary is hereby authorized, subsequent to fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, upon request of the State highway department, to make available to the States, funds for acquisition of rights-of-way in anticipation of construction and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary might prescribe, in amounts equal to 10 percent of the funds apportioned and available to the State within any category of any system under this act, for said acquisition of rights-of-way for roads to be constructed within a 5-year period following the fiscal year in which such request is made on the same participation basis as provided by this act for any such system.

"(b) In order to permit the initiation of this program for the National System at the earliest possible time, the Secretary, in addition to his existing authority to enter into contractual obligation, is authorized to make reimbursements or advances to the States for construction with respect to section 2 hereof, in an amount not to exceed \$500 million during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956: *Provided*, That the funds expended hereunder shall be credited against sums apportioned to the State in which expended for projects under the provisions of section 2 of this act.

"Sec. 6. It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1957, and annually thereafter, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations with regard to the programs herein authorized.

"Sec. 7. In addition to the purposes set forth in section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, there shall be considered in connection with the undesignated mileage of the National System the additional purposes of eliminating bottlenecks in the evacuation routes leading from target areas, as designated by the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and providing such lateral feeder and distribut-

ing routes as may be required to furnish maximum utility of the system. The Secretary shall include in the annual report called for under section 6 hereof a statement showing what designations have been made during the prior calendar year.

"Sec. 8. All agreements between the Secretary and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the National System may contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary. Such agreements shall also contain such provisions as the Secretary feels necessary to insure that the users of the National System will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways in such system, and such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments to be constructed or located on the right-of-way of the National System in such State.

"Sec. 9. The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects in the National System authorized under section 2 of this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276-a).

"Sec. 10. The Secretary is authorized to consider as part of the National System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on this system, whenever such road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of this system as presently designated or as may be hereafter designated. Where a road on which tolls are being collected is incorporated in the National System, the Secretary is authorized to approve connecting projects under this Act to provide the necessary continuous system of highways: *Provided*, That agreement has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project that (1) the section of toll road will become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds outstanding at the time of the agreement, (2) that all toll collections are used for maintenance and operation and debt service of the section of road incorporated into the system, and (3) that there is one or more reasonably satisfactory alternate free routes available to traffic by which the toll section of the system may be bypassed. Where a toll bridge or tunnel is incorporated in the National System, the Secretary is authorized to approve projects under this act approaching any such bridge or tunnel to a point where such project will have some reasonable use irrespective of its use for such bridge or tunnel.

"Sec. 11. The definition of the term 'construction' in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, cost of rights-of-way, cost of relocation of tenants, cost of demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites, and the elimination of hazards of railway grade crossings."

"Sec. 12. So much of the first section and of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorizes appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 13. The provisions of section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to projects constructed pursuant to section 2 of this act.

"Sec. 14. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, together with all acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect and be applicable hereto. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 15. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 16. This act may be cited as the 'National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955'."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order that the substitute amendment is not in order. It is a substitute to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Ohio that it is offered as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Then, if I understand the gentleman correctly, the gentleman from Michigan did not offer a substitute, but offered an amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] offered a motion to strike out and insert, which is an amendment, an original amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MACK of Washington. When would the Mack amendment come to a vote or would the chairman and the ranking member accept the amendment since everybody seems to be in agreement on it?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, which was an amendment to the amendment, will be voted on before any other amendments are voted on.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry there seems to be an inclination on the part of some to keep this bill from being considered from all angles. I first want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I will not take up my time and the time of the membership by going back into all the details that have been argued so many times here this afternoon, and that we of the committee have labored with for over 8 weeks.

I am proud to serve on this Committee on Public Works. I think every member of the committee has made a conscientious effort to bring out a road bill that

will give our motoring public and our defense forces the type of highway we should expect in a country like America.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps we are proceeding here a little too fast. We had full hearings on the highway bill. We had no differences insofar as the need for highways are concerned, or how much it would cost to build them, but we did not use the time that I think should have been taken in committee to consider methods of financing that would have to be devised to pay for these highways.

I will say that the gentleman from Michigan, my good friend, Mr. DONDERO, has worked as hard as anyone to try to produce a program for the American people that could be realized and carried out.

I must say for my friends who take the position that they want the Clay plan, but if you do not want that, they would go along with you on something else. I do not think there are two routes we can follow at all; I think there is one that is best. It reminds me of the schoolteacher who went before the school board for examination and interview for a position. He learned that six members of the board believed in teaching that the world was round and the other six that the world was flat. So when this professor went before them, having heard of this argument, and was asked how he would teach geography, he answered: "As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to teach it either way."

That is the position I think of too many of the membership on my left today.

This substitute amendment in effect is what has been called the Thompson bill. We have in it every perfection made by the committee that has to do with highways. We have in it the same ABC provisions that the Fallon bill contained and that the Dondero bill contained. We have in it all the factors of a realistic approach to the highway program. We want highways to be built. We do not want this program to bog down or to get a program that is way beyond our reach or something the people back home would not like. We want a highway bill, but we want one that our budget will stand.

Did any Member of this House object the other day when we cut \$600 million from foreign aid appropriations? Who stood up to object?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I yield. Mr. MACHROWICZ. Will the gentleman explain whether the same thing which is found in the Fallon bill and which is found in the Dondero bill, namely the Davis-Bacon provisions, are also in the gentleman's bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Yes, that is included. Everything is included that is in the Fallon bill except the financing.

The fact that the Appropriations Committee cut over \$600 million from the foreign aid bill the other day indicates that it is the consensus of the House that we can save the \$600 million from general revenues just from that one source. Now, if you have a residue that will amount to over \$500 million a year for

the next 10 years in the existing highway users' taxes, why not use that, why not look back to see the billions of dollars that have previously been collected from highway users for general purposes? Why not give these highway users their due and not dig deeper into their pockets? If you vote for this substitute amendment, I assure you, Mr. Chairman, we will get a highway bill out that I feel the Senate will accept. We can then start building highways. You cannot build 1 mile more of highway in a period of 3 years with \$10 billion than you can with \$3 billion. The first 3 years is going to be the formative period. You cannot possibly spend the money as fast as the Fallon bill would have you do it for the first 3 years. So why not wait until the 3 years have gone by and let the then Congress pass on it. If the program can be accelerated, let us accelerate it at that time. But as a beginning, I ask you to vote for my amendment. I believe it is a good one.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, does the vote come first on the Mack amendment, including the Davis-Bacon provision, or would it come first on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON]?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will come first on the so-called Mack amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the Thompson substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know much about this bill because it was never considered by the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The bill was presented to the committee twice in the form of an amendment and considered. Of course, it was voted down.

Mr. FALLON. I am sorry to say the bill was never considered as a bill. It was offered as an amendment. It was never read. It was voted down. The committee never considered the bill, therefore I oppose the substitute.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the House that I am opposed, as is the gentleman from Maryland, to the Thompson substitute.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that should this substitute prevail, as offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, you would have a highway bill without any means whatsoever of financing it. That is what you would be up against.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to know that anyone on the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member and on which I have been attending constantly during the hearings on a road bill, say at this late hour that no provisions of the so-called Thompson substitute were ever considered by the committee.

Well, now, let us look at the record. There are 19 sections to the Fallon bill. The Fallon bill and the Thompson bill are identical except for 4 sections. The only section deleted from the Fallon bill is section 4 and the so-called utility provisions of the bill.

The substance of the Thompson bill was indeed considered and it was offered in the form of an amendment on three specific occasions. I do not think anyone who attended the hearings of this committee can refute that statement.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Will not the gentleman see if I am correct in this statement. The first time the committee heard of this particular bill was on the last day when it was offered as a substitute?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman knows that the numbers of the bill were changed but that the substance of the bill had been offered to the committee.

Now let me proceed.

Mr. FALLON. I was trying to ascertain the date on the bill when it was introduced, and I could not get a copy.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, the contents of the bill should not take anybody by surprise because it was considered in the committee in substance on the several occasions I have mentioned.

Let us see what this bill attempts to do. In the first place, it recognizes that there must be an acceleration of the so-called interstate or defense highway system. We increased the amount from \$175 million to \$1 billion a year. In addition to that, we set the amount on the urban, the primary, and the secondary roads at \$725 million with an acceleration of \$25 million until the 10th year, at which time the interstate and the ABC roads will get an equal amount.

Let me point out again to you that in the other 2 bills you are going to spend two-thirds of the entire amount of money, 66 percent, for 40,000 miles of road which are traveled by one-seventh of the vehicular traffic. In the Thompson bill we set aside an increased amount for the interstate system, and next year, on March 1, if there is need for additional taxes, the Committee on Ways and Means can consider this problem in relationship to the fiscal policy of the Federal Government and the overall tax schedule.

I have heard a great deal from the other side of the aisle that we must be forthright and we must come forward with a pay-as-you-go plan; yet those who advocate a pay-as-you-go plan advocate that we create a corporation and issue bonds which will cost in a 30-year period \$11.5 billion in interest alone. Money from the general Treasury of the United States would be used as capital reserve to pay for the highway program.

How irresponsible can you get, to say that you are going to place a harness on the people of this country, a \$36 billion expenditure, and you are not going to raise taxes, nor are you going to disturb the fiscal policy of the Federal Government, and that we are not going to have deficit financing?

There is a moderate and a temperate way that we can go about this program. The road bill is written every 2 years. We can review this legislation in the light of the needs after we have seen the experience of the appropriation of \$1 billion a year on the interstate or defense system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Now, there are two very important sections in this bill that have not been properly covered. In section 14 of the bill we have a so-called reclassification act which upgrades the number of employees in the Bureau of Public Roads. It seems to me that if we want to create new jobs at higher classes of pay, that the department could request the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to look into their needs.

Now I want to talk about section 7. Section 7 provides that the Bureau of Public Roads can reimburse the States up to 50 percent of the relocation costs of a utility occupying the right-of-way provided, of course, it does not exceed 2 percent of the project cost. Why was that put in this bill against the objection of every State highway director in the entire United States?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY] has telegrams from every director of every State highway department, and they are unanimous in their protest against that section. Why was the section written in there? Because under the present law, if a State has a statute reimbursing the utilities, the Bureau of Public Roads would recognize that contractual relationship and would make proper reimbursement. But here we are asking the States to come in and violate the contracts that they have made with the utilities and pass on an even more burdensome debt to the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Members are very tired, and I hope I can conclude what I have to say in less than the 5 minutes allotted to me.

Throughout 18 long weeks of hearings I have sat in the Committee on Public Works and listened to the viewpoints of the truckers, of the railroaders, of the laborers, and, on the other side, the contractors, listened to viewpoints of those people who had a special vantage point from which they viewed this proposed legislation.

And yet there is one viewpoint, Mr. Chairman, which I think should be expressed on this floor, and that is the

viewpoint of the person whom we are primarily responsible for representing, the average American who in the final analysis is going to pay for these roads, regardless of which of these three substitute plans is adopted, and who has every reason to expect his full dollar's worth in roads that he can use.

What is the basic difference between the three plans and their effect upon that average American? First of all, the Dondero plan embracing the Clay Commission proposal embodies, it seems to me, fiscal irresponsibility through the back door. Surely it is not the role of statesmanship for us to pass a bill which would cost the American taxpayer \$1.55 for every dollar's worth of road we build him. Surely it is not the role of statesmanship for us to sit here today and approve a bill which will earmark \$11½ billion, if you please, for interest payments, when that \$11½ billion otherwise could be spent building some 21,000 miles of superhighway.

Surely it is not the role of statesmanship for us, Mr. Chairman, to yoke a succeeding generation 30 years hence, some of whose members are yet unborn, with the responsibility of paying for roads that we had already worn out, simply that we might have a few extra miles on which to ride in comfort now.

For those reasons I think we cannot, in fairness to that average American, support the Dondero substitute.

While I do not approve all that is in the Thompson substitute, as I expressed in my individual views in the report of the committee, I support it now for the reason that it trims down the excessive amount of money set aside both in the Dondero bill and the committee bill for this 1 percent of the roads of our country known as the interstate highway system.

I wonder how many of the Members of this House have looked at the map that delineates this interstate highway system on which each of these bills, the committee bill and the Dondero substitute, asks us to place almost three-fourths of all the Federal Highway tax funds—1 percent of the Nation's highways.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many of the people in this House have looked to see what a very small part this is of the highways in their own districts. There are 40 million families in this country and there is \$31½ billion to be raised in the Dondero bill, which means that the average family in our districts is going to be called upon to pay something like \$775 in extended taxes over 30 years' time, for improvements in 1 percent of the roads—think of it.

Some of our citizens will never drive on one of these superhighways, and many will do so only very infrequently.

What we need is a highway improvement program which will share its benefits more equitably among all of our millions of average American motorists, one which our economy can absorb and our people can afford.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the Members of this House support the Thompson substitute, which brings the entire program into better alignment, which spends the same

on the primary and secondary roads, but which does not make the mistake these other bills do of increasing this small 1 percent of the highway by 8,000 percent over the amount of money appropriated to it last year; and that then we dedicate ourselves to providing the funds to make this program self-liquidating on a pay-as-we-go basis. Perhaps it could be done now; perhaps early next year, but in any event before the authorized expenditures go into effect.

I tried to offer at the desk of the Speaker an amendment to the Thompson substitute. It would have cut the additional taxes imposed by the Fallon bill commensurately with the reduced appropriation and would have come nearer being a pay-as-you-go program than any of the plans that have been offered to us so far. I was informed that my amendment would have been in the third degree and therefore out of order.

It should be obvious, Mr. Chairman, that if we spend anything like the amount authorized in either the committee bill or the Dondero bill, taxes will have to be raised appreciably.

The committee bill takes cognizance of that fact, and for this reason is infinitely preferable to the Dondero proposal which does not. Yet the taxes it imposes, and they are formidable, still fall short of the amount the bill authorizes for expenditure over the 12 years.

A 50 percent increase in the Federal gasoline tax, a 100 percent increase in the diesel fuel tax, a 200 percent increase in the tax on larger tires—these are not negligible increases by any manner of means. Still they do not fully meet the cost.

I agree that those who profit most from the use of highways should pay their fair proportionate share of the cost. Yet let us not deceive ourselves. These taxes will find their way into the pocketbook of the average American through increased costs of goods and services. He will pay most of the bill, however we might devise it.

It is up to us, therefore, to see that he gets his full and complete dollar's worth. It is up to us to see that he gets roads which will be useful and serviceable to him.

It is worth noting that the less abrupt and more moderate increase provided in the Thompson formula will still be the most dynamic road-building program ever undertaken in the entire history of this Nation. I believe it is just about all our economy could absorb without inflationary dislocations.

These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I believe we should support the Thompson substitute and then buttress it with a pay-as-you-go provision, to the end that we may have a reasonable and equitable highway program in the interest of the average American.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was extremely interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas who has just concluded, particularly that part dealing with splitting some of this tax proposal and applying it to the reduction of the bonds and the building of roads, because I had a similar bill prepared.

Here is where we arrive today. We are caught under a rule situation where we have to choose between the pay-as-you-go plan, the plan which provides for setting up the corporation and issuing bonds, or a program which simply authorizes the roads to be built, and then says that on a later date we may find the ways and means to pay the money.

I believe if we examine this thing in our minds for just a moment, we can recognize that if the Dondero bill is accepted, if the provisions which were set up by the Clay Commission are written into law here, that corporation then can proceed with its work and can get this highway program that everyone says is so necessary and desirable underway. This Congress in its session next year, or the next, or the next, or the next, can determine on the basis of the economic conditions of the times, can determine because of the budget situation in that existing year, what is the economic thing to do about retirement of these bonds. Certainly we do not have to be stuck with the program of paying off the bonds according to some calendar schedule. We can raise the money either from some of these taxes out of the general fund or from new levies, but retire these bonds faster.

This is the point I believe a number of the members of the committee have overlooked entirely in the consideration of this road program, and it is a simple fact that during the last fiscal year \$2,300 million were extracted from the pockets of the users of our highways and the money went into the general fund. That money having been earmarked or having been linked to the highway program would have provided every mile of road that is contemplated here without any increase in any taxes and without the issuance of any bonds. I submit to you we are still paying it, and that a program as extensive as this one and a program that is going to involve billions and multiple billions of dollars is something that should be paid for over the years as a result of the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means so that annually, as we make every other appropriation, this program should be paid for. The way to get our roads and to get them fast is to set up this commission and let them issue the bonds and blueprint their program, and we will proceed to pay for it in a logical and economical manner as the years go by.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me where the cement is going to come from to build the roads under this accelerated program? In Iowa today, I am told it is almost impossible for farmers to buy cement.

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot tell you what the productive capacity of the cement concerns of the United States is at present or what their projected capacity may be. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. May I point out to the gentleman that the road building program in the State of Iowa has been retarded this year as a result of a lack of

cement. I wonder where we are going to get the material to build these roads.

Mr. CORBETT. I think, first of all, we better get the money before we try to buy the material and that we get the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the so-called Thompson substitute which is being presented to us today. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the program is a moderate and conservative program. Even though it does have this advantage of moderation and conservativeness, it is still 4,000 percent more for the interstate system than was spent last year. Last year we spent \$25 million for the interstate system. It is proposed under the Thompson bill to spend \$1 billion in the forthcoming year. Certainly that is enough of an acceleration for the interstate system until we have a chance to catch our breath and find out what we are doing. The gentleman from Iowa mentioned the cement shortage which is apparent today. The cement industry recognizes that that is one of the important factors that we must take into consideration before we go too far in this program. If we spell out a program that has to be completed by a certain deadline, what are we going to do to the price of cement? There is another factor in regard to the number of highway engineers who are available. Today it is a recognized fact that we do not have a full supply. I suggest that the members of the Committee read the minority views on page 36 of the committee report and look into some of the factors that are considered here today, when we talk about the importance of taking a little closer look at this interstate highway program. There is nothing in the Thompson bill, as presented to the Committee, which would not make it possible to accelerate the program at any time within the next few years if it became apparent that it was economical and advantageous to do so, and if it became apparent that we could finance it. There are no taxes in the Thompson bill, it is true, but there is nothing to prevent whatever program is put into effect from being financed to a degree when these excise taxes have to be automatically renewed next spring.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. That is my very point. The Fallon bill provides a tax revenue and the Dondero bill provides for a bond issue. How would you build the highways under the Thompson bill, which does not have either?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The roads would be built in the same way as we build them today. The program would be authorized and the appropriation would be made in the light of what the Congress wanted to appropriate.

We are presently spending money on highway bills that have no finance provisions in them. The gentleman's com-

mittee has the responsibility of providing the taxes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Present taxes are now about \$2.5 billion. Surely the Ways and Means Committee could find enough money to finance the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The Dondero plan adds no new taxes.

This bill which is less ambitious would provide for less in the way of adding to the public debt than the Dondero bill, and the Thompson bill provides for a cheaper rate of interest than the Dondero bill.

The Dondero bill would provide for this grandiose corporation outside of public control which would have enormous power over the States in regard to their highway programs, a corporation that has never been considered before. We talk about what we are doing here, this is the biggest public-works program ever conceived in the history of the United States. It is far bigger than all of Roosevelt's and Harry Hopkins' added together in the way of public works, yet under the Dondero bill you would take that out of the control of Congress and give it to a corporation appointed by the President; you would not even have the congressional review which was available under the public-works program.

I suggest that you have here in the Thompson substitute a bill that is not subject to the objections that have been raised by supporters of the other types of bills, something that you can proceed under and start operations under on an accelerated interstate program.

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard some amazing things here today. You would think from some statements that have been made that the purpose of the utility provision in this bill was to deprive the utilities of something. Let me state to you that the purpose of this utility provision is to give to the utilities \$970 million of money that is needed for roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think the gentleman intends to lead the House to believe that the utility provision is in the Clay bill. It is not in there at all.

Mr. GENTRY. It is not in the Thompson bill, either.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the REA's and the mutual telephone companies, the small mutual telephone companies, are interested in this 50 percent provision?

Mr. GENTRY. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that over 85 percent of the REA's and telephone lines and electric lines are either on unpaved roads or on small farm-to-market roads which will not have to be expanded and reconstructed within our lifetime. The expense to REA would be negligible.

Mr. JENSEN. I just want to say, however, that I have had a number of

telegrams from REA's and telephone calls from mutual telephone companies asking me to be in favor of the provision.

Mr. GENTRY. I know the gentleman has; and I know also that most of them were induced by the big utilities who have scoured the country everywhere to get them.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say to my friend that the big companies are much better able to pay this than the little REA's.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. JONES of Missouri and Mr. JONES of Alabama objected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I read the statement the gentleman sent around to all Members of Congress and I want to compliment him on the effort and study he put into this matter. I would like to ask a question that was not covered in that memorandum. Does the gentleman know whether or not the public utilities have set up reserves to comply with their obligations under State contracts to relocate their equipment at their own expense?

Mr. GENTRY. Outside of TVA the public utilities in this act are a very, very small percentage. Of course, the TVA pays no taxes or has to pay any taxes. It gets Government financing.

Mr. MEADER. I want to call attention to the fact that the utilities normally are very conservative in setting up a reserve for replacement of equipment and for everything they have to do, all of which goes into the computation of their rates. I want to ask the gentleman, Does he know whether or not these utilities have set aside a reserve for the relocation that they are required under State law to do?

Mr. GENTRY. Every utility in the country has such a reserve. The major power utilities have \$2,200,000,000 in reserves. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has \$800 million in reserves. All of the others have comparable reserves.

Mr. Chairman, let me read to you what the president of the American Association of State Highway Officials said about this legislation. You know they want this money, they want to build this great system of highways and it takes a lot of courage to come here and object to something that they all want.

Here is what Mr. McCoy, of California, who came here 3,000 miles, said:

The obvious inequity of paying for utility relocation costs out of highway funds is apparent if we ask ourselves this question: Why should utility relocation costs be passed on to the motorist instead of to the consumers of utility facilities, in view of the fact that the consumers have received the benefit of free rights-of-way purchased at public expense?

* * * The utilities are attempting to repudiate their contractual obligation to States, cities, and counties through Federal legislation.

That is exactly what they are attempting to do. They are trying to repudiate their contracts they have in all the States with the States by which they secure free right-of-way. They are coming here to the Congress and getting something which they have been refused in State legislation.

But the State highway officials were not satisfied with that. Only 2 weeks ago they came again before our committee and listen to what the president of the association said:

We wish to say here today for the record that we approve of your action as to providing a construction program and for financing it. We want a highway act of 1955 this session and we will appreciate anything you can do to assure action. We do, however, strongly object to the utility reimbursement feature.

That was when the legislation was practically assured. They came back here for the sole purpose of saying to the committee that we do not feel you should include this provision in the legislation.

Listen to what the American Automobile Association said:

The utilities are making an unconscionable raid to grab money sorely needed to meet critical highway deficiencies.

Now I would like to make this one statement, and I think this sets out this proposal very well. The laws permitting the utilities the use of rights-of-way under certain restrictions and conditions were enacted at the specific request of the utilities; that is, in the States. They have saved and are saving great sums of money as a result of these laws which they got passed in the State legislatures. Rights-of-way have been maintained for them at the expense and inconvenience of the highway users and without expense to the utilities. The new rights-of-way required for the interstate system will cost the highway users billion of dollars. The utilities will not pay 1 cent of it, but they expect to occupy them free of any charge. They expect them to be maintained for them also free of any charge, but the spokesmen of the utilities now demand that the highway users not only buy new rights-of-way for them and maintain them for them forever, but that they also move the utility facilities onto the new locations and pay the removal bill, and that is what they are providing for in this legislation, all without legal sanction, and in most cases in direct contravention of solemn contracts which the utilities asked the States to make with them by which they secured

the valuable right to enter upon the highways in the first instance.

Now, here is exactly what this will do. This would completely and permanently change the historic and legal relationship between the parties; that is, the States and the utilities. It would make the States completely subordinate to the utilities instead of the reverse as it is at present under the States police power.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that insofar as our utility laws are concerned under which we are operating at the present time, the Federal Government does reimburse the States where the States reimburse the utility companies up to 50 percent of their moving charges. In other words, if the State pays 50 percent, the Federal Government will pay the other 50 percent on moving the utilities. Most of the States are doing that at the present time on an optional and hardship basis. There are three States in the United States that are reimbursing the utilities at the rate of 100 percent. Michigan happens to be one of those States at the present time. In my judgment I do not think this Congress should upset or change the operation of the Federal bureau as it has been doing in the past, because I am sure it is fair to the REA and the small telephone lines, because the Federal Government reimburses them, where they, the States, will share 50 percent, where it is determined it is a hardship, and the States pay the other 50 percent on moving cost. I just give that information to the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is now referring to the Fallon bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I am referring to the law as it exists at the present time. The Fallon bill goes farther than that and says that they may, which infers, where the State reimburses none at all, they can get 50 percent Federal money if they apply and the State government O. K.'s it.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Here we have a small town, a municipality, and they have sewers, water, telephone, and electric power lines, and we run a highway through that town and they have to move all of those utilities. Now, many of those small towns own their own utilities. Can the gentleman tell me how those small towns are going to pay this bill?

Mr. GEORGE. In our State that is part of the construction cost. And if they are on the streets and outside of the sidewalk line, as nearly all of them are, it is part of the construction cost and there is total reimbursement.

Mr. JENSEN. Reimbursement by whom?

Mr. GEORGE. By the State and Federal governments. If it is 50-50 money, they divide the cost 50-50. But if we pass this bill now with a provision for 90 percent Federal money and 10 percent

State money, we leave the existing law alone. If we change it to 50 percent Federal money and say that the State "may," that means that the State can pay 50 percent Federal money but they do not have to put up any money of their own at all.

So what is going on at the present time is that 50 percent Federal money and 50 percent State money goes into the cost of moving utilities where the State determines that they owe an obligation so far as construction of the highway is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman say that that law is effective in every State except three?

Mr. GEORGE. Except three. And in those States they follow the policy of reimbursing 100 percent, regardless of where the utility is or what size it is.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Thompson substitute and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. PATMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

INFLATION DANGER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to mention something that has not been discussed yet—that is, I have not heard it discussed; that is, which plan will be in the interest of our country at this time?

There is real danger of inflation facing our country. Which bill would be more inflationary, the Dondero bill or the Fallon bill?

If you issue \$21 billion of bonds, that is the same as creating \$21 billion of money. That is inflationary. If you pay as you go, that is not inflationary.

Right now people are beginning to talk about reducing installment buying, or perhaps cutting it out, because of the danger of inflation. Installment buying amounts to an increase of only about \$1 billion a year. This would be \$21 billion.

There is much talk about housing being inflationary. They say we should reduce the amount of construction in the housing field because it is inflationary. But that would be a very small amount compared to \$21 billion. If we have any danger of inflation in our country, this proposed \$21 billion would be highly inflationary. If we were to adopt this plan, it would probably mean we would have to impose restrictions upon installment buying. It would mean that we would probably have to impose restrictions upon the construction industry—the housing industry—because of the inflationary danger.

We should not run that risk. The truth is that instead of creating more

debt paper and more Government obligations we should be reducing our national debt. We have today about \$704 billion in debts. That means, of course, public debts and private debts. We cannot pay those debts off because no debts, no money. If you liquidate the debt, you liquidate the money. You do not have money to do business on. So anyone who says we ought to pay off all our debts has not thought the question through. We are going to have to have debt from now on out, and a lot more, under our capitalistic system, which is the finest and best system on earth. Nobody has found a better system. You must have debts in order to keep in business. So we are not going to be concerned too much about the debt except to keep it in line and prevent inflation.

Instead of creating more debts and more interest and more inflation, why not reduce our national debt some and then we do not have to be troubled about the installment buying or the housing construction or anything else, as long as we do not increase our overall national debt and our public debt or our aggregate debt?

So this bill that is introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], for whom I have a very high regard, is presented by him as what he believes to be the best answer to the problem, but it is an inflationary bill. It is calling for \$21 billion in extra debt. To say that it is not added to the national debt is phony, absolutely phony. You cannot say that the Government is going to be responsible for \$21 billion more in debt for roads or any other purpose and yet it is not added to our national debt. Possibly you will keep it out of the actual figures but the truth is it will be that much more national debt. You can call it anything you want to but it is increasing our national debt.

We have twenty-nine or thirty billion dollars of Federal Reserve notes outstanding, that currency you have in your pockets, and every one of them says the United States Government promises to pay on demand so many dollars. That is a part of our national debt but it is not carried as a part of our national debt. It is not included but it is a part. It will have to be paid off. This is debt here. You will say you are not carrying it as part of the national debt, but I do not care how you carry it, the people will owe it. It will be a liability. It will be a mortgage upon the property of all the people of our Nation and their incomes. There is no way to avoid it.

Therefore, the Dondero amendment is an inflationary amendment. It should be defeated. We should adopt a pay-as-you-go plan, and any inequalities in the taxes proposed can be adjusted in conference.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the Fallon bill has everything—fairness to all, fiscal responsibility, flexible implications to adjust to full-scale schedules in roadbuilding, materials consumption, high employment, steady payrolls, travel safety, fewer deaths, lower motoring costs for more miles traveled in less time, motoring benefits that can pace the economy of the Nation year after

year in peace with a hum that should make the growth of our gross national product a vital and vibrant performance.

As vehicle-miles increase, so does the growth of our gross national product. The two have been synonymous over the years.

The Fallon bill gives all a chance to hold the line on the national debt as the growth of our gross national product mounts. It is an outstanding and astute accomplishment in the management of fiscal affairs. It is a magnificent tribute to fiscal responsibility in government.

The Fallon bill allows our people, for the first time in many years, to call a halt to deficit financing. It gives them a breather, time to match needs with deeds, fully paid as deeds meet needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have gone to bat a week or so ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a speech on the House floor, urging the Public Works Committee to be careful with its then reported high levies against the motorist, the trucker, and the bus operator to pay for the national interstate road network. I am glad that the Fallon bill takes counsel of that warning.

The Fallon bill is a good bill, eminently fair to all. I shall support it and vote against any bond schemes levied against our people under the cloak of congressional sanction. We were burnt in Hudson County on that bond-flotation score with the New York Port Authority. We do not propose to allow others to be burnt. We urge passage of the Fallon bill.

A capsule of my speech as reported over the wires by the Associated Press follows:

WASHINGTON (AP)—Representative SIEMINSKI appealed to Congress today to consider the tattered purse of the American car owner when it works out financing plans for a new highway building program.

SIEMINSKI, in a speech prepared for the House, called the car owner "the goose that has been laying the golden egg."

"The satisfaction of his needs puts to work tremendous numbers of people in the automotive, truck and bus manufacturing industries," he said.

Yet, he added, the car owner, bus operator and trucker are being penalized with "arbitrary and unreasonable automotive levies."

"For the past 24 years," he continued, "they have paid ever-increasing taxes on fuel and lubricating oils. They are charged with tolls on bridges and tunnels that help pay for projects not connected with their travel, not to mention the tremendous cost to them in man hours paid to keep cars, buses and trucks serviced and repaired throughout the United States with the purchase of spare parts this requires."

SIEMINSKI submitted figures showing that last year the Federal Government collected \$854,666,000 in gasoline and Diesel fuel taxes and \$68,441,000 in taxes on lubricating oils. In addition, he said, the States collected \$2,218,097,000 in gasoline taxes.

The new highway building program will succeed, he said, if framed to fit the purse of all and "to call a halt in the foreseeable future to the mounting cost of motoring in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the provision in this bill which will insure that wages on this

tremendous Federal-highway project will be at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality where the construction is going on—all in accordance with the legislation commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931.

Two years ago when other Federal construction legislation was before the Congress, I went back in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to review the history of the Davis-Bacon Act. The authors of this law were Senator James L. Davis, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who was later Secretary of Labor in President Hoover's Cabinet. Representative Robert L. Bacon, Republican, of New York, had long been interested in legislation to cover such situations. This act is not new, having been passed in 1931 under a Republican Congress and a Republican administration.

At that time there was a real reason for the necessity of such legislation. On several Federal projects previous to 1931, it had been the regular procedure of some low-bid contractors to ship in cheap labor from backward areas. Many of these contractors housed their men and fed them on the project itself. I am sure the Congress can understand, in view of that unwholesome situation, why the Davis-Bacon Act was passed.

In practically all Federal construction since that date the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act have been applied in order to assure local communities that local prevailing wage standards would not be endangered. The Davis-Bacon Act now applies to all direct Federal construction as well as to contracts for schools, hospitals, housing, and airport projects constructed with Federal-aid funds.

I am happy that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], in offering the Clay committee substitute bill, asked that the House amend his substitute to include the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. By his amendment the gentleman from Michigan has assured the House that both the Fallon bill and the Clay bill will contain the applicable provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since by far the greatest part of the national highway system, provided for in section 2, will be financed by Federal funds, I am sure the Members of the House feel that labor standards normally applicable to Federal construction should also apply to this great arterial-highway system. This action has only the effect of preserving and affirming, rather than extending the longstanding policies of the Congress in matters of Federal expenditure and procurement. It is my understanding that in extending the application of this act to highway construction, the committee did so with the thought that all determinations made by the Secretary of Labor will be based on the prevailing wage rates on similar construction in the immediate localities.

All of this act follows the recent pattern and history of the Federal Government insofar as wage rates are concerned in local communities. It is a fair provision and is in the best interests of all of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman

man from Washington [Mr. MACK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is the Bacon-Davis amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in no position to reply to that, but, without objection, the amendment may be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the Mack of Washington amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana) there were—ayes 89, noes 178.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE SUMMIT OF FREEDOM: ITS INDIVISIBILITY — ON THE JUST CAUSE OF UKRAINE AND OTHER CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Four Power Conference in Geneva has stimulated a great deal of public discussion on the issues of war and peace, colonialism and imperialism, liberation and the continued captivity of nations in the Russian Communist empire. Fortunately, some of this discussion has been based on fundamental factors of political reality that lead us in no way to exude optimism over the outcome of that conference. On the other hand, quite discomfiting are the many fallacies and myths that have cropped up in this discussion to cause serious wonderment as to the depth of our general knowledge and understanding of the recent history and political actualities of Eastern Europe.

One such fallacy is that the so-called satellite countries alone are deserving of freedom and national independence. What of the freedom and national independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, that are now an illegally incorporated part of the Soviet Union? What of the freedom and national independence of Ukraine which, with its population of over 40 million people and rich industrial resources, stands not only as

the largest captive non-Russian nation in the enslaved part of Europe, but also is the most strategic base for further Russian Communist aggression? What of the freedom and national independence of the many other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union—Byelorussia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Cossackia, Turkestan, and others—who along with Ukraine and the Baltic States make up approximately 120 million people, exceeding the total population of the satellite countries? Are these captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. a forgotten segment of humanity to be sacrificed in the appeasement of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism? A true and honest espousal of freedom and national self-determination cannot in moral and political principle tolerate a double standard, accommodating some degree of imperialism and colonialism, at that over a greater area of resources and population.

Another striking fallacy in current discussion is the contemplation of a peaceful coexistence of nations while the Iron Curtain continues in existence. The continued existence of the Iron Curtain is in blunt fact the very institutional contradiction to a peaceful coexistence of nations. Moreover, its elimination will not be achieved, as many mistakenly believe, by the process of liberating only the so-called satellite countries. This process would only serve to move it eastward to a territorial position where the first Iron Curtain was approximately set up about the borders of the Soviet Union in 1923. Whether to the east or west, so long as any Iron Curtain exists, the grounds for a genuine and durable peace are absent.

A very significant political work in connection with the Big Four Conference is the scholarly memorandum presented to President Eisenhower by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This memorandum on The Summit of Freedom: Its Indivisibility was prepared and submitted by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, well-known professor of economics at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. On the basis of the inherent indivisibility of freedom, it advances the freedom cause of all the captive nations in the Red colonial empire, including the Russian nation, and necessarily concentrates on the just cause of Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. Its objective, systematic presentation explodes the myths and fallacies to which I have referred here only in part, and offers a challenging analysis which deserves the careful examination of every American who soberly faces the problems of our foreign policy and the issue of war or peace.

Because I believe that this memorandum will be of interest to all Members of Congress, I am including it in my remarks.

THE SUMMIT OF FREEDOM: ITS INDIVISIBILITY—ON THE JUST CAUSE OF UKRAINE AND OTHER CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.

I. SOME CONCRETE MEASURES OF REAL SUCCESS

"We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase

fancied gain for ourselves." (Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

In the full spirit and meaning of your quoted declaration we cannot but view the points listed below as some of the concrete measures of real success—indeed, in themselves veritable tests of the sincerity of Moscow's representation—in this conference. Surely, secure grounds and bases of genuine peace could not be achieved should this conference prove to be another expression of the cold war and merely revolve about a meeting of persons rather than a meeting of minds. In our judgment, without the consummation of such a meeting of minds on basic principles of political and social order, implemented by certain possible gestures of mutual good will in the interest of peaceable relations among nations and peoples, the outcome of this conference will only serve to justify the considered position of countless observers and analysts that this is simply another episode in the Communist strategy, staged on the highest diplomatic level, to purchase valuable time for the current genocidal consolidation of the Red colonial empire, as a necessary prerequisite for more decisive aggressions against the free world. History shows in factual abundance that wars are prepared in intervals passing for peace, and the present Russian Communist preparation is no exception.

Unless, in unbridled emotion, the peoples of the world, the free and the enslaved, are expected to pay hollow utterances to "Peace—It's Wonderful," it appears to us, as well as to other informed groups in the Soviet Union, that, ironically enough, we shall be purchasing "fancied gain for ourselves" if our resolve to "never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people" falls short of translation in the form of specific tests, political challenge, and courageous advocacy of fixed and unalterable principles. It is in the hope of witnessing the realistic translation of this moral resolve at this summit conference that we advance the following points of test and challenge:

1. In cognizance of the inherent indivisibility of freedom, a declaration on moral and political principles of national independence, sovereignty, and self-government of all nations and peoples, including Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

2. Systematic relative disarmament with airtight international control and enforceable inspection at any selected spatial point, necessarily involving the coverage of special armed security units like the MGB and the MVD in the Soviet Union.

3. Based on the fundamental conduciveness of the cultural intercourse of peoples to peaceful relations, the complete abolishment of the Iron Curtain which by definition would preclude its mere transfer eastward to the present borders of the Soviet Union.

4. In the vibrant spirit of Bandung, the rejection of imperialism and colonialism which in relation to Moscow can only be overtly demonstrated under international authority by the staging of free elections in the so-called satellite countries and the free exercise by Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations of the legal right reserved to them in article 17 of the Soviet constitution which reads, "The right freely to secede from the U. S. S. R. is reserved to every Union Republic."

5. Generated in a cultivated atmosphere of a universalized Declaration of Independence, proposals for the elimination of Moscow-directed agencies of infiltration and subversion and, in the interest of peaceful relations between nations and peoples, notably Ukraine and Byelorussia as now recognized by us in the United Nations, the complete liberation of 20 million people held in Russian Communist labor camps, including millions of Ukrainians and uncounted numbers of other non-Russians such as former

German, Austrian, Rumanian, and other war prisoners, all those people held in abject slavery contrary to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter which reaffirms "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women" and likewise contrary to the express provisions of the Soviet constitution which, under article 9 "precludes the exploitation of the labor of others" and under article 118 "guarantees the right to employment and payment for their work."

Careful thought and reflection devoted to each of these concrete points reveal that close correlation between peace and freedom which can emerge only in stages but which, nevertheless, is based on specific grounds of test and challenge validated both by principle and historical truth.

II. THE INDIVISIBILITY OF FREEDOM

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." (Abraham Lincoln.)

In essential truth, the summit of freedom is its indivisibility. The quoted words of one of our greatest Presidents ring truer today than even at the time they were uttered. By virtue of our miraculous technological advancements in the past century, the house today is the world. And again in the words of Lincoln, it "cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." In their own dialectical fashion all leading Communist theoreticians have substantially expressed the same idea in the cause of Communist slavery. The dynamics of historical development permit no other outcome than either the triumph of freedom or that of slavery. In upholding the torch of morality and political principle we cannot pass the unique historic opportunity provided by this conference at the summit to underscore the nature of the summit of freedom itself.

In real terms, the indivisibility of freedom is brilliantly reflected today in the patriotic struggles for the complete freedom of Korea, China, Indochina, Manchuria, Mongolia, areas in Africa, the satellite countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania, and the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union—Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Turkestan, and others. Driven by the natural force of enlightened nationalism, these patriotic struggles for unified freedom, national independence, sovereignty, and self-government are intrinsically related at the summit of freedom and involve vast territories and peoples to warrant the most serious consideration in this conference at the summit.

Only perpetuated fallacies, carved in part by arid legalism, could in rational defiance of the indivisibility of freedom restrict the areas for the test and challenge of freedom. Contrary to one current fallacy, the record of Communist conquests commence in 1920 rather than in 1940, with Ukraine and the independent non-Russian republics as the first victims of Russian Communist imperialism. As in the case of later victims, the Government of Soviet Russia recognized the Ukrainian National Republic on December 17, 1917, only to subvert its independence and conquer the country shortly thereafter. Contrary to another popular fallacy, the record of broken Communist treaties also begins in the period following World War I, as in the case of its numerous treaties with independent Ukraine, Georgia, and others, rather than on the eve of World War II.

Fortunately, these and other gravely misleading fallacies have been powerfully dispelled by the official documented reports of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives. Hearings leading to the official publication of the Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations

of the U. S. S. R. and the objective scholarly presentation in Special Report No. 4 on the Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine, as well as in other special reports on different non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, have authoritatively established the permanent record on Communist aggression since 1920. The truths they reveal substantiate beyond question of doubt the indivisibility of freedom as manifested these past 35 years in the unrelenting struggle for national independence on the part of the Ukrainian and other non-Russian nations. Their official contents stand to mirror the compromise of freedom and principle that would be incurred in the fact of the cumulative sequence of Communist aggression since 1920, should arid legalism prevail to arbitrarily date this record from the 40's. The house would still be divided against itself and could not stand, especially since the largest and most resourceful non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe would remain in captivity and continue to serve as a strategic springboard for expedient Communist aggression in the future.

III. CONTROLLED RELATIVE DISARMAMENT

"I do not believe that we—or other nations—dare accept less than a truly effective enforceable system of international inspection and control. This is one case where half a loaf is not better than none." (Bernard M. Baruch.)

The emotional predication of certain arguments regarding world disarmament on the horrendous consequences of nuclear warfare upon civilization and humanity appeal more to the fear of man than to his reason. The paralyzing effects of fear may well be concessions of appeasement that could really spell the end of civilization in its true meaning. To confuse civilization with its material external expressions that in any war are vulnerable to attack and devastation, no matter what the degree, is to misconstrue its substance and meaning as revealed in the traditional wisdom, cumulative knowledge and moral evolution of man. Armaments are indeed the means of warfare and admittedly, their systematic, relative reduction would produce wholesome, conditioning effects toward real peace, but ultimately the magnitude of the means is determined by the particular ends contemplated by the parties involved, ends which can be gleaned from the record and institutions of each.

Considering the scope and magnitude of the means of warfare available today, it has been pointedly stated by one of our foremost citizens who has devoted himself to the problem that "this is one case where half a loaf is not better than none." The elements of official Communist perfidy, long records of broken promise and aggressions, and Iron Curtain protection for the execution of dishonoring maneuvers underlie the truth of this prudent statement. As attested to in the greatest measure by the long experience of Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations with characteristic Moscovite chicanery, proposed agreements to outlaw atomic weapons or to contribute to a peace pool or to maintain certain ratios of armament status fall far short of the present requirements of real disarmament for peace.

With the easy diversion of fissionable material for war or peace, international agreements, least of all with Moscow, are patently inadequate, unless an airtight, enforceable system of control and inspection at any selected spatial point is provided for. This control should be extended to all major means of warfare, and should include the armed security forces of the MGB and the MVD in the Soviet Union. Also, this control should be effectuated on the basis of a program of relative disarmament and so conceived as to preclude any temptation at violation of contracted agreements. In short, internationally controlled relative disarmament

lifts the Iron Curtain surrounding the means of warfare and doubtlessly concealing the calculated formation of the surprise attack.

IV. ABOLISHMENT OF THE RUSSIAN IRON CURTAIN

"It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped." (Dean Acheson.)

The historic Russian institution of the Iron Curtain does not merely surround the buildup of means of warfare. As the classic observation of the Honorable Dean Acheson indicates, the Iron Curtain has been an institutional necessity to the process of encroachment and consolidation of Russian totalitarianism, whether White or Red, over centuries of imperialist and colonial growth. In the contemporary framework, the first and original Iron Curtain was thrown about the conquered nations of Ukraine and others in 1920, and in the instant historical interval of 20 years was moved westward to envelop other hitherto independent non-Russian nations, like Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and others. Thus, to seek only the liberation and independence of the so-called satellite countries—to be sure, an admirable feat in itself—could only mean to seek the removal of the Iron Curtain roughly to the borders of the recent past, which certainly would not insure a durable and just peace.

On careful analysis, the institution of the Iron Curtain, which has served to perpetuate the centuries-old oppression of the great majority of the Russian people itself, is a proven necessity for the dual Russian Communist policy of effectuating, on the one hand, systematic genocide, political terrorism, and a continuous aggression against the many non-Russian nations already brought into the captivity of the Red colonial empire and, on the other hand, of spreading its fraudulent propaganda on "the workers' paradise," "equality and sovereignty of nations," and so forth, in gullible quarters of the free world. The Iron Curtain supports also in its institutional way the subversive and political aggressive activities of Moscow in the free world. This role is substantially by no means new, for as Mr. Acheson's classic statement shows, "The Russian rulers liked to bet on sure things: to be in a position to cut their losses when events showed that they had overreached themselves. They have not wanted to risk everything on a single throw of the dice. The Politburo has acted in this same way. It has carried on and built on the imperialist tradition. What it has added consists mainly of new weapons and new tactics—the weapons of conspiracy, subversion, psychological and ideological warfare, and indirect aggression, and tactics skillfully designed to employ these weapons." The evidence shows in abundance the fashioning and refinement of these techniques of infiltration, "intensive revolution" and subversion in the early destruction of the independent Ukrainian National Republic and those of the other non-Russian nations now held captive in the Soviet Union.

The continued existence of the Iron Curtain, situated at whatever borders, is a crass mockery to the concept of the peaceful co-existence of nations, a concept which, significantly, was first used by Lenin and his associates in relation to independent Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the period of 1917-20. The Iron Curtain thrown about these countries, following their Russian Communist conquest, has proved so effective that many Westerners evince, even today, scarce knowledge and understanding of the long histories in the fight for freedom and independence of these non-Russian nations.

In the interests of truth and peace, one of the most challenging tests of Moscow's sincerity for peace is this proposal for the abolishment of the Iron Curtain. No force is

more fundamental to the peaceful coexistence of nations than the free cultural intercourse of peoples. The freedom envisioned here, with the nonexistence of the Iron Curtain, goes far beyond the current propaganda theatrics of select invitations and planned tours in the Soviet Union. This greatest challenge for truth and peace at this conference poses the freedom of peoples—all peoples who truly seek peace—to travel where they wish and to observe for themselves the actual conditions of life in all quarters of the globe.

V. BANDUNG, GENEVA AND THE ANTICOLONIAL CHALLENGE

"It came naturally to the United States to take a lead in this matter. We ourselves are the first colony in modern times to have won independence. We have a natural sympathy with those everywhere who follow our example." (John Foster Dulles.)

On the basis of the truth stated by our morally spirited Secretary of State, the striking example of Ukraine and other colonies in the vast Russian Communist empire unquestionably attracts our natural sympathy. The modern histories of these captive non-Russian nations are epics in the struggle against despotic Russian imperialism and colonialism. They unmistakably form integral parts of the overall movement of peoples and nations in this century, leading to the collapse of empires and the independence of nations with distinctive cultures, languages and histories. This is the moving spirit of our century which recently was crystallized at the historic Bandung conference.

The spirit of Bandung is the tremendous moral force infused into the complex of international affairs today by former colonial nations. The wholesomely impassioned representatives of these nations speak from recent experience. They speak eloquently in behalf of all remaining colonial and dependent nations, especially the many non-Russian nations reduced to this status in the past 35 years. As history well shows, Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations were the first to be subjected to Red colonialism with their forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union. They were the first to taste the unsurpassed colonialism of Red Moscow, savoring as it does of incomparable economic exploitation, genocide, russification, and slave labor.

The spirit of Bandung has found current expression in our own Congress, and this committee takes pride in having supported House Resolution 149 which, in unanimous passage, expresses "the sense of Congress on the maintenance of traditional United States policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism." We agree wholeheartedly with the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, comparing the language of this resolution with that of the Declaration of Independence and emphasizing that "just as the Holy Scriptures are read and reread and the eternal truths which they expound are constantly proclaimed, so it is essential for a united America to proclaim to the world the fundamental principles upon which our Government, Nation, and people rest."

In fitting response to this ringing call of the people's representatives, no more propitious occasion for this proclamation of principles could be had than this conference at the summit. The spirit of Bandung cannot be stilled at Geneva: the real and most outstanding issues of this century cannot be avoided if peace with freedom is at stake. Where God-given, inalienable rights are at stake, no double standard is permissible. No half or quarter empire is thinkable, since empires, like cancer, though in part emaciated, regrow with even greater intensity. A philosophy denying these rights cannot possibly live side by side with one cherishing them, and the Communists know this best. "Live and let live" becomes sheer

rhetoric where an unrelenting struggle for the free exercise of these God-given rights of independent national existence is involved. The anticolonial challenge to Moscow's sincerity for peace can best be transmitted at this conference in proposals for free elections in the satellite areas and the exercise of the legal secession right in the captive non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union. Stalinist cynicism had always confirmed their right to secede but negated the power of exercise. Believers in freedom, however, know that this power resides in the very essence of the right.

VI. A UNIVERSALIZED DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

"The right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts." (Woodrow Wilson.)

These are—"for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." Few have expressed with equal eloquence the supremacy of rights in relation to peace than this great President and ardent advocate of the national self-determination of peoples. Had this principle, which is a precious part of our American tradition, been generally applied after World War I, it is safe to say that a durable global peace could have been achieved. Certainly, there would not be today the Communist imperialist menace, the long record of Communist aggression and absorption of foreign territories, had the large and resourceful independent republics of Ukraine, Turkestan, Byelorussia and others been assisted and sustained by the powerful proponents of the principle of national self-determination.

Most ironically, this sacred principle is being widely exploited today by the Russian Communists as it had been even before they ascended to power. During the period of chaos that followed the abdication of Czar Nicholas II, the Ukrainian nation, for example, now of some 45 million people, recovered its liberty and founded its own independent and democratic state, the Ukrainian National Republic. However, it is well documented historically that to bring about the permanent collapse of the Czarist reign, Bolshevik propaganda as concocted by Lenin, Stalin, and others aimed at this very development. It viewed the colossal centrifugal force of enlightened nationalism in the non-Russian regions of the Empire as a potent instrument for this desired end; and in the same way that Moscow exploits nationalism today in various parts of the free world, so in this early period of Bolsheviks advocated the principle of national self-determination in the most unequal terms. Then it was to break up an empire to implant themselves in power: now, as shown brilliantly in Indochina, it is to divide the free world in order to extend to the point of completion the gigantic program of empire building begun once they seized power in 1917.

Freedom's challenge to Moscow and its expedient espousal of this basic principle is the abolishment of the Iron Curtain and, under the authority of the United Nations, the conduct of free elections and the exercise of the secession right in all of the non-Russian nations of the Red colonial empire. This is the test of a real application of a principle that Moscow professes for the ears of the free world.

As Mr. Acheson declared in testimony before a congressional committee, "We are stressing here that independence is the great thing to start with. If peoples are really independent and they are not satellites of anybody, then we can begin to work with them, because they have got something

which we understand." In an empire, such as the Russian Communist empire, all neighboring nations are satellites, especially the captive non-Russian nations in the formal structure of the Soviet Union, who in geographic area, population, and resources exceed the other non-Russian nations. In relation to all of them, truly, "Independence is the great thing to start with," and only a universalized declaration of independence, for which we are best fitted to initiate in order to achieve that universal dominion of right, can adequately express the force of freedom at this conference. Independence is the real, solid basis for understanding and thus peace among peoples. It is the primary requisite for a true community of nations and the logical prerequisite of any scheme of free federation of nations. Indeed, the very independence of the great part of the Russian nation, in surcease of tyranny, oppression, and economic privation sustained for centuries by absolutist Russian expansionism, is dependent on the independence of all non-Russian nations in this Red colonial empire.

VII. PEACE—FREEDOM—COMMUNIST SLAVERY

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise."

The high Communist functionary, Dmitri Z. Manulski, continues in this remarkably significant vein. "The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concession. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist." These seemingly prophetic words were uttered in 1930 to international students at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow. They embrace thoughts repeatedly asserted in other words by all high-ranking members of the Russian Communist regime. In prediction of time and circumstance they vividly picture the very exhibitions staged before our eyes today. The spectacular Communist circus on peace is on the road and a Barnum-like audience is forming in the free world, leaping at another chance to be friends.

These words, as indeed masses of others, spell out the same fixed and unalterable formula, peace—freedom—Communist slavery. As indicated before, present Communist theatrics in the ostensible interest of peace, performed by way of planned tours, ballets, sports participation, a world assembly for peace in Helsinki, misleading Austrian treaty concessions and numerous other deceptive demonstrations, furnish not an iota of real evidence in the desire for a durable and just peace. Instead, they constitute propaganda projections on a world scale of what, in 35 years of intimate experience with Russian Communist tactics and deception, every patriotic Ukrainian and other captive non-Russian in the U. S. S. R. has come to know as the Iron Curtain on true information, the verbal facade behind which the real Communist activity is feverishly pursued. At this very moment of overflowing peace talk, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian youth and those of the other non-Russian nations are being corralled and shipped to Central Asia in the buildup of a tremendous agricultural base relatively insulated for large-scale war; Communist agents are infiltrating all sectors of Vietnam for the eventual kill in Indochina; North Korea is rapidly becoming a huge arsenal for planned things to come—to mention only a few instances of real Moscow-centered Communist activity behind its verbal facade of peace.

The most ominous aspect of the current scene is the evident Communist play for time, to consolidate within, neutralize without, attain to a striking adequacy of nuclear weapons, and finally to strike in Pearl Harbor style for the greatest stakes the world has ever known. This Communist calculus for world conquest finds open credence in the very words quoted above. It finds more than ample real credence in the entire documented course of Russian Communist history and strategy. Unless real tests, as proposed here, are advanced sooner or later, and several should be at this conference on peace and freedom, then undoubtedly the sinister formula of peace—freedom=Communist slavery will gain the time necessary for its real application.

In the nature of things, the growing psychology in some quarters of giving the people several more years of "peace" through relative inaction and endless diplomatic truck is productive only of a fatalist resignation to inevitable war and short-run losses of existing opportunities to really prevent the outbreak of a third world war. As long as the Iron Curtain exists, at whatever borders, the fulfillment of a peaceful coexistence of nations can only remain as an ideal. The only alternative opportunity open to us is not, as some mistakenly impute it, the course of preventive war, but rather a full-grown peaceful policy of liberation that, in fact, is capable of disrupting the applied Communist calculus for world conquest. The efficient cause of liberation throughout the Red colonial empire is independence and national self-determination. It is, at once, the just cause, not only of the so-called satellite nations, but also of the 120 million people in the captive Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. It is the cause, both efficient and just, that necessarily must find expression in the conference at the summit if the summit of freedom itself is to tower above all else in the true interests of peace and all of humanity.

Our hopes and prayers are constantly with you, as those of countless other Americans cherishing firm conviction in a "universal dominion of right," a dominion that cannot but encompass Geneva, a dominion that reigns in the hearts of all in behalf of whom this memorandum is hereby respectfully submitted.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman,
Ukrainian Congress Committee of
America, Professor, Georgetown
University.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the water pollution control bill, S. 890, and the New Orleans gulf outlet bill, H. R. 6309.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 317, Rept. No. 1445)

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6645) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7029) to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out all after "rate" down to and including "deposit" in line 5 and insert "to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month preceding the deposit on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DR. JONAS E. SALK GOLD MEDAL

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 278, to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DAVIDSON. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in recognition of the great achievement of Dr. Jonas E. Salk in the field of medicine by his discovery of a serum for the prevention of poliomyelitis, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. For such purpose there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,500.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved and gratified by the unanimous action of the House in approving the bill which I introduced to present a gold medal to Dr. Jonas E. Salk. In authorizing the coining of this special medal we recognize the accomplishment which he has made. This young doctor has opened the door to the conquest of infantile paralysis. As a result of his great work, made possible by the contributions of all Americans to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis March of Dimes campaigns, many lives will be saved; many children, our most precious national resource, will be spared untold agony. The parents of America and the world will no longer live in fear of this dread crippling disease.

During the last 16 years the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has expended a total of \$25,541,662.14 for direct research for the development of a poliomyelitis vaccine. The annual March of Dimes campaign, conducted by the national foundation, received the support of the entire Nation. The money so generously contributed by the people made it possible for scientists to intensively study the problem. Dr. Jonas E. Salk first entered the fight against polio in 1942 when he joined the staff of the University of Michigan as the recipient of a National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis fellowship. In 1951 he began his direct research at the virus research laboratories of the University of Pittsburgh on the vaccine now being used.

The Salk vaccine is the result of a painstaking and intensive research program in which live polio virus is treated by chemicals so that a delicate balance is struck in which the ability of the virus to cause disease is eliminated by meticulous

lously calculated chemical additions but still leaving the virus with sufficient potency to stimulate antibody production. Dr. Salk, as the name of the vaccine indicates, was able to develop this vaccine. In his tests at Pittsburgh he proved that the vaccine which he produced was able to raise the antibody level. In the nationwide field trial held by the National Foundation last year Dr. Salk's vaccine was proved highly effective in preventing paralysis. Over 1,830,000 children throughout the United States took part in this massive trial. During the last 2 years Dr. Salk wrote and published over 12 medical papers concerning immunization against poliomyelitis.

Dr. Salk is a modest man; his parents, too, have with pardonable parental pride, shown great humility. I do not think I exaggerate, however, when I say that the people of the entire Nation and of New York, particularly those who live in my district, Manhattan's west side, take great pride, as I do, in Dr. Salk's achievement. We are proud of him and of the training which he received from his parents and the New York City school system which helped mold the great scientist we know today.

I think it fitting that we express our thanks and appreciation to Dr. Salk. This modest recognition of his work and that of his fellow scientists is the very least that a grateful Nation can do.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5512) to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive.

Page 2, line 13, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is agreeable to the ranking Republican minority member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR JULY 27

The SPEAKER. Before any more Members leave the Chamber, the Chair desires to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] to announce the program for tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement of the Chair, when the House convenes tomorrow at 12 o'clock we will continue consideration of H. R. 7474, the highway bill. If that bill is disposed of at a reasonable hour, it is planned to begin, and if possible, finish general debate on the Natural Gas Act. The House will convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow but it is planned to convene the House at 10 o'clock on Thursday and possibly on Friday. On Thursday we will continue the consideration of the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman does not know what the program is for the balance of the week?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot advise the gentleman at this time as to the program for the balance of the week.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6259) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act entitled to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Sec. 2-1706" and insert "Sec. 2-1708."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF TEACHERS, SCHOOL OFFICERS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1093) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ABERNETHY, DAVIS of Georgia, JONES of North Carolina, MILLER of Nebraska, and HYDE.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF SENATE TO MAKE A CERTAIN CHANGE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 53.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary

of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2428) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes, to make the following change, viz: On page 5, line 15, of the engrossed bill, strike out "63f-63k" and insert in lieu thereof "61f-61k."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 593) to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits the Government to sell back to the State of Texas 100 acres of land near Whitney Dam and Reservoir. There will be no money expended. The bill provides that the land will be sold back for no less than the amount the Government paid for it.

Mr. MARTIN. It goes back to the State?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. To be used as a State park.

Mr. MARTIN. And the National Government did not pay anything for it in the first instance?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The National Government paid something, but it will get no less than it paid for the tract of land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, have any improvements been made by the National Government?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No; no improvements have been made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the bill been approved by a committee?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. By the Committee on Public Works unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Texas, for public park and recreational purposes only, such areas within the portion of Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Texas, designated by the Corps of Engineers as Towash Park and designated by the State of Texas Parks Board as Lake Whitney State Park, as he shall deem essential to provide building sites for permanent buildings and other improvements for public park and recreational purposes, but not to exceed 100 acres, at fair market value as determined by him, which in no event shall be less than the cost to the Government of acquiring such areas, and under such terms and conditions as he shall deem advisable to assure that the use of said areas by the State will not interfere with the operation of said dam and reservoir

project and such additional terms and conditions as he shall deem to be advisable in the public interest.

The conveyance authorized by this act shall not pass any right, title, or interest in oil, gas, fissionable materials, or other minerals.

In the event actual construction of said buildings and improvements has not commenced within 5 years from the effective date of this act, or in the event said property shall cease to be used for public park and recreation purposes for a period of 2 successive years, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FACILITIES ACT OF 1950

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 829; 50 U. S. C. 881-886) is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 3 is amended by deleting the phrase 'in an amount not to exceed \$250 million over a period of the next 5 fiscal years' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'in an amount not to exceed \$500 million over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951'.

"(b) Subsection 3 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) contribute to any State such funds as he shall determine to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate or convert facilities owned by such State to the extent required for the joint utilization of such facilities; and

"(2) contribute to any State such funds as he shall determine to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate or convert facilities owned by such State to the extent made necessary, or to acquire, construct, expand, rehabilitate or convert such additional facilities as he shall determine to have been made essential, by any conversion, redesignation or reorganization of a unit or units of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States requested or authorized by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively."

"(c) Subsection 4 (b) is amended by deleting the words 'with regard' and substituting therefor the words 'and shall have consented'.

"(d) Subsection 4 (c) is amended by inserting after the word 'acquired' in line 7 thereof the words 'by the United States'.

"(e) Subsection 4 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Each contribution made pursuant to section 3 (b) or 3 (c) of this act shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, shall deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That except as agreed at the time the contribution is made the facilities provided through contributions

made pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) or 3 (c) of this act shall be subject to joint utilization only to the extent deemed practicable by the State concerned. No contribution shall be made under section 3 (c) for any armory in an amount exceeding 75 percent of the cost of the additional or improved armories to be constructed: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of such computation the amount to be contributed by any State shall be exclusive of the cost or market value of any real estate which may be contributed by the State concerned for the purposes of section 3 (c) of this act."

"(f) Section 6 is amended by (1) inserting immediately after 'Sec. 6.' the following: '(a)', and (2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) All construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion of facilities in each State pursuant to section 3 (b) or 3 (c) of this act shall be done in accordance with the laws of such State and under the supervision of officials of such State, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of Defense."

"(g) Subsections 7 (b), (c), and (d) are redesignated subsections 7 (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and subsection 7 (b) is inserted to read as follows:

"(b) 'Armory' means a structure which houses a unit or units of a Reserve component and is used for the training and administration thereof, including such appurtenant structures as may house equipment used in the training and administration of such unit or units. All other facilities shall be considered nonarmory for the purposes of this act."

"(h) Subsection 7 (d) as redesignated is amended to read as follows:

"(d) 'Reserve component' shall include:

"(1) The National Guard of the United States;

"(2) The Army Reserve;

"(3) The Naval Reserve;

"(4) The Marine Corps Reserve;

"(5) The Air National Guard of the United States;

"(6) The Air Force Reserve; and

"(7) The Coast Guard Reserve; and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the measure does?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure was taken up by considering the Senate amendment before the Committee on Armed Services this morning, and they agreed unanimously to the Senate amendment. This bill was passed for the purpose of providing facilities for training in the Reserves in the several States throughout the United States. It supplements the original act which provided \$250 million and was expendable over a 5-year period of time. This is expendable over an 8-year period of time, and the amount has been raised by the Senate. But, in consideration of the fact that the Reserve program is expanded now, the committee reviewed it this morning and unanimously approved the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, was this bill passed by the House?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Oh, yes. It passed unanimously. I think there was hardly 1 vote, perhaps, against it. The gentleman was one of those who supported it, too.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this amount has been increased.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The Senate increased the amount but also extended the time. The House set a more limited time in which to spend the money. The Senate thought it wise to give more time to spend the money but increased the amount. That is the only difference. It provides for armories throughout the several States as well as general facilities for Reserve training throughout the several States. Every State in the Union will be affected.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman it was my understanding at the time the bill was passed—I think I am correct in saying this—that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] at that time said that this appropriation was to increase the armory facilities of the country and did not take into account the needs of the Reserves.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. As I remember, I handled the bill when it came to the House originally, but I will say this: It has been in operation for 5 years, and the authorization has been exhausted, and under the terms of this bill the Government is permitted to expend so much per year over a period of time for armory construction, and the States will match the funds in certain cases.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I thought at that time that this was the forerunner of the passage of the bill which went through the House yesterday, but at that time I was assured that some other legislation would be necessary in order to provide the facilities for this new Reserve setup.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This would have been necessary regardless of the bill that passed, the National Reserve training bill. It would have been necessary because we have been consuming the money over a period of years in helping to build armories for training under the present program, and not contemplating the bill that was passed recently.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDALS COMMEMORATING THE 120TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE TEXAS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7244) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this came out of the committee unanimously

and has been approved by the Treasury Department.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. One question I would like to ask. If my recollection is correct, several years ago we discontinued these medals as being an attack on private industry and that we were going out of that business. Have we been doing much of that lately?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. This is the only one that I know of that has been approved, but this was approved by the Treasury. It seems to me a new policy which, of course, is a good one.

Mr. MARTIN. I was questioning that. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc., 2,000 medals 1½ inches in diameter, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

(b) Upon authorization from the Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc., the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Friday, July 29, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MR. DAIRY FARMER, YOU CAN HELP CONGRESS RAISE YOUR INCOME

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, dairy farmers in my district, the Ninth Wisconsin District, are confronted with an economic situation which for everyone is serious. For many, the situation is outright desperate. Mr. Speaker, there are dairy farmers in my

district who are being driven out of business by the ruinously low level of income resulting from the present administration's dairy price-support policy.

VETERANS HARDEST HIT

Hardest hit of all, I regret to say, are the young farm families, particularly the young veterans who began farming within the past half-dozen years or so. They bought their farms, their machinery, and livestock at high prices, in a period when dairy products were selling at 100 percent of parity. They are being squeezed out of existence by present-day prices which are permitted to rest on the very bottom of the mandatory support law.

The dairy-price situation in my district is a genuine depression for us. It has cut farm family incomes to the bone. It is cutting into the standard of living of businessmen in the cities and villages whose prosperity is tied to that of the farmers in their community.

DAIRY-FARM DEPRESSION

The dairy farming depression is the basic problem of the Ninth District of Wisconsin. It is the main problem of many other districts in this country which depend mainly upon income from the food products from manufactured milk. It is a vitally important problem to every citizen in such districts. It is vitally important to the whole Nation also, for it threatens the supply of milk, our basic food. The dairy depression threatens the prosperity of our whole economy. For these reasons, I want to discuss the causes and consequences of the dairy farming depression, and to review with you the proposal I have offered in my bill, H. R. 4360, as something we might do to cure the dairy depression. Something must be done. We cannot afford to sacrifice our dairy farmers against the wall of indifference that is raised against their distress by the administration.

DAIRY INCOME DOWN 50 PERCENT SINCE 1952

Mr. Speaker, milk for manufacturing purposes was selling for 100 percent of parity at the end of 1952, just before the present administration took office. Now, only 2½ years later, prices average only 75 percent of the same standard of parity. This means a 25-percent cut in gross income for producers of manufacturing milk. Moreover, this cut of 25 percent in gross income only begins to tell the full seriousness of the situation. At least 60 percent of gross sales receipts is required to pay production costs. This means that the 25-percent cut in gross receipts results in more than a 50-percent cut in the net income of dairy-farming families, a 50-percent cut in their "take-home pay," which is what they have to spend for family living expenses, for educating their children, for savings against their old age. The average dairy-farming family in my district, with prices at 100 percent of parity, received a monthly net family income of approximately \$200 per month. They are now asked by this administration to accept a cut in take-home pay to about \$100 per month. That figure is far below a decent American standard of living. I do not think this Nation can jus-

tify paying such a shamefully low return to dairy-farming families who are, I believe, about the hardest working people we have in the entire country.

The Eisenhower administration maintains that dairy income should be left at this present low level. Secretary Benson has refused to exercise his authority to give additional support to dairy product prices, and he has vigorously opposed all efforts to do so by legislation. Secretary Benson has not made any suggestions for changing the present dairy situation and, in fact, has declared it should be left exactly as it is. In this position, he has had the full support and encouragement of President Eisenhower.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY CUTS FARM PRICES

The administration's policy of favoring reduced incomes for dairy farmers is entirely consistent with its policy of forcing all farm prices downward. Mr. Speaker, I know it sounds harsh to assert that it is the policy of this administration to force farm prices down. But that is exactly what it has done, and it has been done deliberately. On every opportunity allowed him under the new law, the Secretary of Agriculture has deliberately cut the price supports on every farm commodity when doing so would result in permitting prices received by farmers to fall. There can only be one conclusion reached by observing what this administration has actually done to farm prices. That is that the administration's policy is to drive farm prices down. In addition to using every legal opportunity that has occurred to cut farm prices directly, the administration has endorsed, lobbied for, and propagandized in favor of changing the farm laws, to permit even greater reductions in farm price supports.

FOOD PROCESSOR CALLING SHOTS

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose today to attempt to examine the motives behind this administration policy of forcing farm prices down. Certainly the presence in high positions in this administration of many representatives of the big food-processing corporations which have profited greatly during the past 2½ years from reduced prices paid to farmers for their raw materials, while they maintained their resale prices to consumers at close to their alltime high, suggests a plausible explanation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a list of some of the representatives of the big food processing companies serving in the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Brooks of Texas). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the list is as follows:

USDA PERSONNEL WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROCESSING COMPANIES

James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary: Commodity Stabilization Service; owner of Grange League Federation Exchange; executive vice president, Commercial Molasses Corp. (farm marketing association); director, Pacific Molasses Corp.; director of Farm Foundation.

Walter C. Berger, associate administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service; owner of Des Moines Oat Products Co. (feed manufacturing); president (1946-52), American Feed Manufacturers Association; director of National Grain Trade Council; director of Western Grain and Feed Association; vice president and director of Shea Chemical Co.

M. D. Smith, executive assistant to Benson; Director of National Association of Frozen Food Packers; manager of family plants—Smith Canning & Freezing Co.; Smith Frozen Foods (Oregon and Idaho).

N. R. Clark, special assistant on commodity disposal; vice president of Swift & Co. (retired).

Earl Hughes, director of Commodity Stabilization Service; Trustee of Foundation for American Agriculture and of Farm Foundation.

Also Milton Eisenhower is a member of the board of directors of Quaker Oats Co.

A Department of Agriculture representative testified before the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee that the price to consumers of fluid milk has gone down only four-tenths of a cent—from 23.4 cents per quart in 1953 to 23 cents in 1954. But I will not dwell on this. My purpose is to explain what has happened and what its consequences are to dairy farmers.

EISENHOWER CAMPAIGN PROMISES

Mr. Speaker, dairy farmers in my district and in other dairy-producing areas are particularly disappointed in the Eisenhower administration's farm policy as it has developed in practice. Less than 3 years ago, dairy producers were led to believe that the Republican candidate for President intended to improve their situation, not to make it gravely more critical. I do not ask you to take my word for this. I want to read you the words of General Eisenhower himself, the promises which the Republican candidate for President made to farmers within a few miles of the borders of my district, in his major farm speech at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952.

General Eisenhower said, and I quote:

I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair and full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal in ways that minimize Government control and protect farmers' independence. And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

We must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable goods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, then on perishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." But we can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

CAMPAIGN PLEDGE NOT HONORED

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration faced the first test of President Eisenhower's campaign promises to producers of perishables shortly after taking office in January 1953. Before April

1 that year it was necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the price support rate to be in effect for dairy products for the ensuing year. After much hesitation and a great deal of concern on the part of dairy farmers, and requiring the trade to transfer its inventories to Government storage, the Secretary announced that he would support prices of dairy products at 90 percent of parity, the maximum level authorized by law, and the same as had been kept in effect by the preceding Democratic administration.

Ninety percent was the promise. But, unfortunately, that promise was not observed. Although 90-percent supports were announced, the Secretary of Agriculture deliberately refused to make them effective to support dairy prices at 90 percent of parity. Prices of dairy products actually averaged only 83 percent of parity throughout the year running from April 1, 1953, to March 30, 1954. This happened because Secretary Benson refused to set the dollars-and-cents purchase price for milk products high enough to provide prices to farmers of 90 percent of parity, as he had promised.

As 1953 proceeded, the cut out of the consumers' dollar for milk products taken by the middleman was increased so much farmers no longer got 90 percent of parity. Benson refused to increase the Government purchase price of manufactured products sufficiently to make up for the larger cut taken by processors. Consequently, the farmers' share did not come up to the promised 90 percent of parity.

DAIRY FARMER CUT TO 75 PERCENT OF PARITY APRIL 1, 1954

Then, on April 1, 1954, the Secretary of Agriculture openly exercised his policy of cutting farmers' incomes to the bone. Effective on that date, Secretary Benson reduced dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity, the minimum allowed by law. This resulted in an immediate further collapse of prices for dairy products, from which they have never recovered to this day.

BENSON TINKERING CUTS DOWN DAIRY PARITY

Even though supports were slashed to the minimum allowed by law, the administration's drive for lower farm prices was not satisfied. In preparation for the next stage, the price-cutting step, Secretary Benson began to tinker with the definition of parity for manufacturing milk. He was not permitted by law to cut the percentage of parity below 75 percent, but he did have the authority to accomplish the same thing by juggling parity itself downward, and that is exactly what he proceeded to do. His predecessor in the office, Secretary Charles Brannan, had supported prices of manufactured dairy products on the basis of a parity equivalent computed as 88½ percent of the parity price for all milk sold at wholesale. Secretary Benson, as soon as he had cut price supports to the legal minimum of 75 percent of parity, took a new base period and cut parity on manufacturing milk from 88½ percent to only 84.1 percent of the parity price of all milk.

In January 1955, using the same device, Secretary Benson took a further step, reducing the parity equivalent on manufacturing milk to only 83.7 percent of parity price for all milk. This had the effect of cutting parity itself by 5½ percent, so that by the exercise of his discretionary authority, Secretary Benson has reduced the minimum price support floor protection established by law to 69½ percent of parity, or less, as it had been calculated by former Secretary Charles Brannan.

MILK PRODUCER ON SLIDING SCALE

Beginning last April 1, 1955, the price support in effect for manufacturing milk has been exactly the same, in dollars and cents, as it was in the preceding year. But because parity itself has been manipulated downward, it comes out to a higher percentage of parity. For example, prices received by farmers in June 1955 averaged 80 percent of Secretary Benson's manipulated parity. But they averaged only 75 percent of former Secretary Brannan's parity.

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN ORATORS TRY TO FOOL DAIRY FARMERS

Secretary Benson's manipulation of the parity formula computation for manufacturing milk has been exploited by Republican campaign orators, who point with pride to the fact that milk prices now average 80 percent of parity, without ever mentioning that parity itself has been skidded downward by Secretary Benson. In short, Benson's policy is to give the farmers percentage points without the dollars and cents. You cannot buy groceries or pay the taxes with percentage points. It takes dollars and cents to do that. The same policy of cutting the parity formula is being followed for other important commodities to manipulate their dollars and cents support prices downward.

The administration's manipulation of the parity computation for milk is, to my mind, one of the most threatening aspects of its cruel aim to drive farmers' prices down. It is, in effect, evading the intent of Congress when it declared by law that dairy products could not be supported at less than 75 percent of parity. Without ever changing the law, this loophole gives Benson the opportunity to slice off more and more from the dairy farmers' price floor. When parity has been cut far enough, he can raise the percentage points he is giving the farmers—while at the same time, the dollars and cents that go into the farmers' pockets are being reduced.

THEY ARE NOT TELLING ALL THE STORY

Mr. Speaker, I have stressed this matter of manipulation of the parity computation because it is particularly hard for our friends who are not in the dairy industry to understand it. The dairy farmers themselves are not deceived by it. They read the dollars and cents that are printed on their milk checks. But many of our friends, when they read the percentage points that are printed in newspaper headlines, or hear them discussed on the radio and television or in campaign speeches, might be led astray by this Republican policy of paying the farmers in percentage points of a downward manipulated parity computation,

instead of in the dollars and cents that it takes to provide an American standard of living.

The Eisenhower administration's cynical manipulation of parity on milk raises what to my mind is of urgent importance from the standpoint of the dairy farmer. That milk must be made a basic commodity, with a realistic parity defined and assured by law, so that it cannot be juggled and tampered with by an administration that is bent on using every possible means to force farm prices down.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to the best of my power to achieve for milk, our basic food, the recognition in our farm legislation that it deserves—that of a basic commodity able to get equitable protection with other important farm commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to commend the gentleman for his untiring efforts in behalf of the farmers of the Nation, particularly the dairy farmers. I feel that he has here pointed out the fallacies of this administration which seems to believe that reduced prices, higher costs, and reduced production will not appreciably hurt the farmer. In my opinion it is ruining the farmer and will eventually be felt in the towns and the cities. I thank the gentleman for presenting these facts.

SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMEN FROM OTHER AREAS NECESSARY TO PASS DAIRY LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. The problem of our dairy farmers is far too serious to be made into a political football. It needs to be approached with hardheaded commonsense. It is not a political issue; it is an economic issue. Representatives from dairy-farming districts are obligated to treat it as an economic issue, and to refrain from injuring the interests of their dairy-farming constituents by playing politics with their welfare.

It is a simple, clear-cut fact of life that the first concern of anyone who is sincerely interested in helping the dairy farmer must be to secure and maintain unity in the ranks of agricultural Representatives. There simply are not enough Representatives from dairy districts to pass a law all by themselves. We must have allies, or we are doomed to fail. Congressmen representing the various farm commodities must hang together or we will, so to speak, all be hung separately. Our best hope for getting support for dairy farmers lies with the Representatives from other agricultural areas. Without that support, the cause of any kind of legislative help for the dairy farmers' problem is futile. Anybody from the dairy area should know that in order to get legislation through the committee, it is necessary to get support from a majority of the 34 members of the committee. At the present time, there are only 6 members of the full Agriculture Committee who represent concentrated dairy areas.

Since I came to Congress in January 1954, I have made it my primary concern to determine what is needed to win for dairy products the protection granted to the basic agricultural commodities. I have reached certain conclusions. The fundamental one is that before any measure to give basic price-support protection to dairy commodities can be passed, Congressmen representing areas that produce other agricultural commodities must agree to its support. That is a hard-boiled fact of political life, and anyone who is sincerely interested in getting a dairy price-support program through Congress has got to consider it.

YOU CAN'T SIT ON BOTH SIDES OF THE FENCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to my friend the vice chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that the logical thing for anyone to do who is seriously interested in getting 90 percent support for dairy products is to at least offer to accept the same kind of production controls which have been accepted by every one of the present basic crops.

The gentleman will remember that I have repeatedly offered to support a 90 percent support program for dairy products if the dairy people wanted to accept controls. I know the gentleman has taken a sane and reasonable position, but he has some colleagues who seem more interested in asking for something than in getting anything for the dairy farmers.

I am sure the gentleman will remember the so-called Laird amendment which this House rejected early this year. I know the gentleman voted for it, realizing that any vote against it would be misrepresented, but in all honesty, can the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is so well informed on, and deeply interested in, dairy problems, state that that amendment was either fair or practicable? Would the gentleman say that any experienced Member of this House could have expected to pass such an amendment. Would he even contend that dairy farmers should get 90 percent supports and at the same time enjoy unlimited production while every other producer in this country has to accept strict controls in order to get this support? Would the gentleman yield long enough for me to read an editorial out of the latest edition of Hoard's Dairyman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield further.

Mr. POAGE. The editorial is as follows:

[From Hoard's Dairyman of June 10, 1955]
HOUSE SKIPS DAIRY

Perhaps one good thing came out of the bitter House of Representatives debate on farm price supports. It was clearly demonstrated that neither political party had much to offer in the way of a peacetime dairy program.

There are a few individuals within each party who know the dairy industry and have made constructive suggestions. Unfortunately, the majority of Congressmen

have been unable to comprehend the complexities of the dairy industry and fail to recognize the essential ingredients of a sound dairy program.

During the most recent congressional election, northern Democrats, primarily from the big cities, promised great changes in dairy prices if their party was elected to control the Congress. From the South, however, Democratic congressional leaders cautioned the higher dairy price supports must carry with them effective production controls such as are applied to the so-called basic crops.

Most Republican candidates preferred to support the flexible price-support program rather than go to production controls.

When the showdown came in the House of Representatives, both political parties backed away from production controls and higher price supports.

There are people, of course, who believe that we can have higher price supports without production controls. When this was proposed by Representative LAIRD (Wisconsin), southern Democrats turned him down because production controls were not provided.

In our opinion, the logic of the southern Democrats is sound. The Government simply cannot continue to buy up the huge quantities of dairy products which are stimulated by higher prices on all milk and cream produced. From the dairy industry's point of view, it cannot have its cake and eat it too.

What is often overlooked is that there are different types of production-control methods, some of which are considerably more appealing than others. For example, we would strenuously object to a strict quota type of control. On the other hand, as indicated before in these columns, a two-price system is desirable, workable, and effective. There is no limitation of production but only the domestic market is supported at a given price level. The foreign, industrial, and relief markets are free-price markets and farmers receive whatever milk brings in these markets.

At one time we estimated that the application of the two-price dairy program to American dairying last year would have resulted in an increased income to dairy farmers of over \$700 million. All this would have been at no cost to the Federal Government. Frankly, we regret that the Congress does not give the dairy industry a chance to handle its own stabilization program. We are convinced that it can do a far better job than the Government has done to date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. The gentleman is so right. When the House refused, as we certainly knew in advance it would, to give dairy commodities all the protection given to the basics without any of the responsibilities, these Republican dairy district Representatives voted against H. R. 12.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Wisconsin has faithfully attended all meetings of the Agricultural Committee. Does he not know that the members who have been actually trying to solve the dairy problems have been working with the producers of other crops in an effort to get a common approach. I know that the gentleman voted for 90 percent supports for all commodities including dairy products. I know that the gentleman has offered this House a sound, constructive program of 90 percent supports for a controlled production of dairy products. I am glad to work with the gentleman or any other member who wants to treat dairy products just like cotton, wheat and tobacco, but I can't go along with, and this House won't go along with, those who ask that

the dairy farmer be given all of the benefits and none of the burdens of a 90-percent support program. The chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee tells me he expects to hold some hearings out in the gentleman's area this fall. I am not a member of that subcommittee but as a member of the full committee who is interested in dairying, I hope to be able to attend and to take part in some of these hearings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Texas is a dairy farmer himself. I want to thank him for these remarks. I want to commend those few Republicans in this House who remained faithful to the economic interests of their farmer constituents, who placed the welfare of farmers above the dictation of the political potentates of their party. Most of the 22 Republicans, who are about one-tenth of all their party's members in this House and voted for H. R. 12, were from cash grain-producing areas, not from dairy districts.

H. R. 12 RAISED MILK SUPPORTS

But the House Committee on Agriculture is continuing to give the dairy problem a very large share of its attention. Very promising progress is being made. In passing H. R. 12, the House of Representatives went on record against any further cut in dairy farmers' prices next year by the Benson device of manipulating parity downward below the minimum allowed by law under the Brannan parity formula. H. R. 12 raised the minimum price support floor from 75 percent of parity to 80 percent. It continued for 2 more years the \$15 million annual appropriation for brucellosis indemnity payments. It increased from \$50 million to \$75 million the annual appropriation for purchasing fluid milk for schoolchildren on which school authorities in Wisconsin particularly have done such an excellent job in the past year. This is not yet victory, and it is not enough. But it is something, and it is progress.

CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON PROMISED SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMEN FROM BASIC AREAS TO MAKE MILK A BASIC COMMODITY

My colleagues in the House from areas which produce wheat, rice, tobacco, peanuts, cotton, and other basic commodities have promised time and time again they will back my efforts to make dairy products a basic commodity if the dairy farmers will accept the same responsibility for keeping supplies in line with demand that producers of other basics have accepted.

I introduced H. R. 4360, a bill to designate dairy products as basic commodities, which provides for marketing quotas on milk, so that we could find out what dairy farmers really want. I have been told by the chairman that the Dairy Subcommittee will try to hold hearings on this bill so that dairy farmers can tell the Congress what they think of it. I have strongly urged all this session that such hearings be held. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that if dairy farmers do not want this bill, I would be the last one to urge it and I will immediately begin to search for another way out of the dairy farmers' dilemma.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin has made a splendid statement. Having served as a Member of this House for more than 20 years, during all of which time I have been a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have, of course, seen Members of Congress come and go. I am glad to have this opportunity to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin upon the splendid manner in which he has performed all of the duties of his high office. He has been at all times intensely interested in the problems of the dairy farmers. He thoroughly understands their problems and he has constantly had their welfare in mind. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, no Member of our great Committee with whom I have served, has been more interested in the problems of dairy farmers than has Lester Johnson. He has not only been interested in dairy farmers and in their problems, but he has been interested in the problems of all of the farmers of America.

Our Committee on Agriculture is composed of 37 Members of Congress—34 from congressional districts within the States, and in addition to these 34 Members, we have a Delegate from Hawaii, a Delegate from Alaska, and a Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. As chairman of that great committee, I have appointed 16 subcommittees, and during the present session of Congress more bills have been referred to our committee in this one session than were referred to the committee during the entire 2 years of the 83d Congress.

The author of every bill referred to our committee during this session, who has requested a hearing on his bill, has been accorded a fair hearing.

In addition to attending the meetings of his own subcommittee, and the meetings of the full committee, LESTER JOHNSON has attended the meetings of other subcommittees to which legislation relating to problems other than dairy farmers has been referred. LESTER JOHNSON has tried diligently and faithfully, during his entire service on the Agriculture Committee, to learn all he possibly could about the problems of farmers, and while on other subcommittees he has had no right to vote, he has demonstrated more interest in the problems of American agriculture, generally speaking, than any other member of our committee. He knows that no segment of our agricultural economy can prosper at the expense of any other segment of our economy. He knows full well that farmers cannot be successful and prosperous if they are fighting among themselves.

LESTER JOHNSON knows that if we are to have a successful farm program, which is essential to the welfare of our Nation and to the well-being of our farmers, we must understand each others problems and that we must not fight among ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any Member of this House who has more conscientiously nor more consistently applied himself to the performance of his

duties as a Representative in Congress than has Mr. JOHNSON.

LESTER JOHNSON has made many friends in both political parties during his brief service in the House of Representatives, and he is held in high esteem not only by the Democratic Members of this House, but also by Republicans, because all of us know that he is thoroughly trustworthy, he is honest, he is upright, he is forthright, and he is faithful. When I say that he is faithful, I do not mean even to suggest that he is merely faithful to a party. I mean only to emphasize the fact that he is faithful to the principles of a truly representative democracy.

During my entire service in Congress, while a humble member of the House Committee on Agriculture as well as during the times I have served as chairman of that very important Committee, all of the chairmen of that committee and I have tried our dead level best to keep partisan politics out of our deliberations. The problems of agriculture are paramount to all other problems. We shall never be able to solve the problems of peace until we solve the problems of agriculture. A hungry world will never be a happy world. Hungry people are easy prey to all the isms and alien concepts of government.

I am certain that the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now addressing the House has never been prompted by partisan politics, either in voting in our committee, or on the floor of this House.

The problems of agriculture are not only paramount to all other problems, for upon the good earth all mankind must of necessity depend, but these problems should at all times be above partisan politics, just as our foreign policy should at all times be above the bondages of partisan politics. The problems of agriculture and the problems of the unhappy world in which we are living cut across party lines, and State lines, and even across international boundaries. In dealing with these important problems, which are so vital to the world and to all mankind, a Member of Congress has no right to be partisan. In dealing with these problems he must be a statesman rather than a politician.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some false accusations, some unfair innuendoes, and some unfair, inaccurate, and unwarranted statements have been leveled at LESTER JOHNSON. Merely because he has shown an interest in the welfare of all of American agriculture, and has voted for programs essential to the welfare of farmers in other sections of America, it has been suggested, in sinister fashion, that he has not been as interested as he should have been in the welfare of dairy farmers. Let me here and now nail that, and all of that, to the cross. The dairy farmers of America have no greater champion in the Congress of our country than LESTER JOHNSON. There is never an hour of the day or the night that he does not have the welfare of the dairy farmers close to his heart.

Now let us face up to the facts. As a Member of Congress I have never advocated, nor shall I ever advocate, high fixed price support levels for any agri-

culture commodity the producers of which are not willing to attempt to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demand. The producers of basic agricultural commodities have consistently indicated their willingness, by accepting acreage allotments and marketing quotas, to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demand. We have worked out a program over the years, and we have provided the machinery which has enabled, and will continue to enable, the producers of basic agricultural commodities to keep production in line with consumer demand. The producers of beef cattle have not been able to arrange or to define a program to keep the production of beef in line with consumer demand, nor have the dairymen of America offered a program to keep production down to the level of consumer demand. I appreciate the great difficulties involved in both beef cattle production and in dairy production. Both of these important segments of our agricultural economy are quite different from cotton, peanuts, and tobacco, and the other basic commodities which very readily lend themselves to production control. If the producers of beef cattle and if the dairymen of America will offer a production control program, I want to assure them that I shall be the very first to offer my cooperation in an effort to provide adequate price supports. Notwithstanding all the things that I have said, the fact remains that I voted for and our committee reported a bill to support dairy products at 80 percent of parity, and we did this at a time when the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, had dropped the boom on the heads of dairy farmers.

Although members of our committee did everything possible to assist dairy farmers in their desperate plight, we were forced by the Eisenhower administration to strike out the 80 percent of parity price support for dairy products. Although Secretary Benson for about 14 long months had the authority to lower the price supports on dairy products gradually, and to relieve the intensity of the impact and shock on dairy farmers, he waited for 14 long months and then "dropped the boom," and it was a deadly blow. I have never complained that the Secretary waited to take action, but I did complain when he dropped the price support, by one stroke of the pen, and overnight, from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. Even President Eisenhower said publicly at a press conference that the change should be made gradually. Not Mr. Benson—who was slow to action, but finally dealt the death blow to the dairy industry.

In this situation LESTER JOHNSON, Congressman, who is now addressing the House, did everything he possibly could in behalf of dairy farmers. He voted for high price supports. Having a very personal knowledge of the problems involved, he tried to ascertain the views and the wishes of dairy farmers, and I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that those of us in whose districts other important agricultural commodities are produced, actually followed LESTER JOHNSON's leadership in our efforts to aid the dairy industry of America, but I must,

in fairness, repeat that I cannot even now say that I am willing to support the unlimited production of dairy products at 90 percent of parity, when my own farmers are forced to reduce their acreage and their production to keep that production in line with consumer demand and to provide the accumulation of huge surpluses.

Not knowing just what the dairy farmers of America really want in the way of a farm program, I have agreed with my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON, that our committee should give further thought and consideration to the problems involved, and I have directed our dairy subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman THOMAS ABERNETHY, is chairman, to conduct hearings in Wisconsin and in other dairy States, during the recess of Congress, and to make every effort to ascertain the wishes and the views of our farmers who are now engaged in the dairy industry. I hope very much that I can arrange to attend these hearings, and I shall make every possible effort to do so. With 16 subcommittees working on various problems, all of which are vital to the welfare of our farmers and to the general welfare of all of our people, it would be difficult for me to arrange to attend the meetings of the subcommittees which will hold the hearings on the problems of dairy farmers. I want to assure my friend from Wisconsin that I shall do everything I possibly can to attend the meetings which will be held in his congressional district, and in other congressional districts in which dairying is of great importance.

Again I want to compliment my beloved friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON, upon his efforts and his interest in all the problems which so vitally affect the welfare of the people he has so well represented.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], chairman of our Dairy Subcommittee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I say to the gentleman that I am interested in the bill he has introduced. In my judgment, it is worthy of the dairy farmers' consideration. It is not my purpose, however, to press the bill upon the dairy farmer unless the dairy farmer wants that type of legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that is the same attitude I have. I want to find out what the dairy farmer wants.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the attitude of all of us in regard to all of the farm program and particularly with regard to the basic program.

I know there is considerable interest in the gentleman's State in the work of the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. Throughout the year I have been serving as chairman of that subcommittee. I have received numerous communications from dairy farmers in that State indicating their interest in this subject, in the legislation proposed by the gentleman, and in other

legislation pending before the committee. It is the thought of our subcommittee that we may visit the gentleman's district in the State of Wisconsin sometime during the recess. I do not know yet whether we will be able to work that out or not, but I want to say to the gentleman, since he has discussed it with me, and extended the invitation, that I hope we can work it out. I am going to do my best to bring the committee up there this fall.

I commend the gentleman on the service he has rendered the people of his district. I think they were very wise the day they decided to send him here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank my friend from Mississippi.

CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI FROM WISCONSIN
PUBLICLY GIVES SUPPORT

I am most grateful to my Republican colleague from the 10th District of Wisconsin for the support he has pledged to me in this effort to explore the wishes of the dairy farmers. I would like to refer my colleagues at this point to the exchange between myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin that occurs on page 5782 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 5, 1955, during the debate on H. R. 12, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Along with the gentleman from the 10th District of Wisconsin, I also voted last year against flexible farm price supports and for rigid supports at 90 percent of parity.

I might state to the gentleman from the 10th district that in the House Agriculture Committee meeting of March 8 we tried to get 90 percent supports for dairy products without quotas or controls. After this motion lost, I offered an amendment to support dairy products at 85 percent of parity without quotas or controls.

On the vote, which lost by 14 to 13, I had the support of 10 Democrats and 2 Republicans in addition to my own vote. Eleven Republicans and three Democratic members of the committee voted against my motion.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, which provides for quotas and controls. I shall support the present amendment for 90 percent. I am in the same position as the gentleman from the 10th District. If we are unsuccessful in passage of this amendment, I wonder if the gentleman will support me in my effort to make dairy products a basic commodity if the dairy farmers of the United States want such a program with the same procedure for controls and quotas that apply to other basic commodities.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think so. I think one of the reasons for the illness in the dairy industry is the lack of marketing quotas. I think one of the basic reasons why the dairy industry is in the pinch and mess it is in today is because we have not had these controls.

For instance, whenever a farmer in Kansas was cut down on his wheat acreage, he turned those acres into a dairy farm. As the acreage was cut for the wheat farmer and the corn farmer and the tobacco farmer, they turned those acres into dairy farms. If we had controls to prevent those people from going into the dairy business on the side, we would not have the difficulty we have today. I do not believe we should have 90 percent of parity and pile up surplus upon surplus. I want to be reasonable about this. I think if we do have dairy products included in this bill as a basic commodity, that we also ought to have the Department of Agriculture work out a system of quotas, because it is the only way in which we could operate within reason.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

My purpose in introducing that legislation was to find out what farmers in the dairy areas really wanted, so that we could have hearings and determine just what they wanted. If the dairy farmer does not want it, I would be the last one to urge it.

CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON INTRODUCES BILL TO MAKE MILK A BASIC

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to explain the provisions of my suggestion that dairy producers be authorized by law to regulate their marketings in order to qualify for basic price support legislation.

During our consideration of H. R. 12 and in the hearings of the dairy subcommittee, there has been increasing discussion of the use of marketing quotas. Most Members of Congress feel that if milk is to be given 90 percent price supports, then milk producers should agree, like wheat, rice, tobacco, peanut and cotton producers, to limit their marketings to put some controls and a top limit on the quantity of product to be supported. I have talked extensively in the past several months with many Congressmen, particularly from areas that produce basic commodities. They have assured me repeatedly that they will support my effort to give milk the recognition it deserves as a basic commodity with the same price support protection given to the other basic commodities, if dairy farmers will accept similar responsibility for keeping the supply of milk in line with the demand.

As a result of such discussion, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, to authorize a referendum among dairy farmers on the use of quotas. My purpose was to stimulate discussion on the subject, to get suggestions on how quotas might be applied, and to determine the sentiment of farmers themselves on such a step. Milk producers in Federal milk market areas already regulate the supplies of milk offered to the retail fluid market. My bill would extend this principle to milk used for butter, cheese, and other products.

WILL MILK PRODUCERS ACCEPT MARKETING QUOTAS?

The argument against adequate supports run in this channel. You cannot have adequate supports without control over supply. Then, it is said, milk producers won't accept marketing quotas. Thus, a false dilemma is set up and results in no action. Dairy farmers themselves need to help correct this impression. Most Congressmen appear to have been led to believe that dairy farmers are opposed to quotas. The processor groups told us that. The big dairy companies have told us that.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the Agriculture Committee will take the time to go out in the country to see what the dairy farmer really wants. I realize that the processor whose income increases with each 100 pounds he processes is against limiting the supply as it may reduce his income. We in Congress need to find out what the milk producer himself thinks. He does not have the money or the time to come to Washington to tell us.

My bill, H. R. 4360, is not the final answer. No one is more willing than I to admit that. We in Congress do not have

a corps of research experts in the various agricultural fields, nor thousands of employees scattered across the Nation to refine plans and report farmer opinion as are under Secretary Benson's control. We must depend in a large measure on volunteered suggestions, criticisms and reactions expressed in our mail to refine and test policy suggestions.

H. R. 4360 is performing the function I had in mind when I introduced it. Many suggestions have been made to me in regard to it. It is my hope that, after completing hearings at points throughout the dairy producing areas, the dairy subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee will introduce a revised version of my bill which incorporates the improvements that are brought out by these hearings.

It is my feeling that dairy farmers will not oppose a reasonable combination of production payments and marketing quotas when they understand the situation and that, if Congress should couple such payment and quota system with an improved level of price supports, the plan would be accepted.

FIVE PERCENT OVER PRODUCTION CAUSED POULTRY FARMERS TO GET 19 PERCENT LESS

The nub of the dairy problem is the production of 6 to 10 billion pounds more milk annually than will clear the market at present price levels and population numbers.

This overproduction is a temporary problem because, if we could hold production steady at the present level for just another 2 years, population increase would then absorb the current total production of dairy products.

The problem is not one of an enormous and perpetual surplus, and interminable Government price support. It is one of assisting the dairy farmers while demand catches up with production at price levels fair to the farmers.

It is not fair to our farmers, Mr. Speaker, for them to take a severe economic beating just because they do their job a little too well and produce a few percent more than the market will absorb at a fair price. Look at the situation with eggs last year, for example. Farmers sold just 5 percent more eggs in 1954 than in 1953. This small increase in production knocked prices down so far that the total income from 5 percent more eggs in 1954 was 19 percent less than their total receipts from the smaller volume of eggs in 1953.

WAR YEARS WE ENCOURAGED OVERPRODUCTION

Dairy production was encouraged and stimulated in the war periods of the last decade. Improved technology has added to total output. Demand has been weakened by the failure to maintain full employment, economic conditions, the competition of tax-free colored oleomargarine, and some decline in exports.

We have the problem, as I see it, of helping dairy farmers stay solvent for 2 to 4 years while demand catches up to their normal output. It would be possible to impose drastic marketing quotas on dairy products and limit production to what the market will absorb by that device alone. Such a solution would heighten the economic distress of dairy farmers, not relieve it. It would

be the scarcity solution, hard on both the farmers and the consumers. I am opposed to any such course.

BASIC AIMS OF JOHNSON DAIRY PROPOSAL

I am greatly interested, however, in the plan proposed in my bill, that we use a combination of production-adjustment payments along with marketing quotas to handle the problem. If dairy farmers generally approve the idea, I would work and vote for it.

Briefly, the basic aim of my dairy proposals are as follows:

First. That the production of milk and its products be maintained at a level that will provide fully as much as the people of this Nation need and will consume if they have the level of incomes that would be provided in an economy of full employment.

Second. That we expand consumption of dairy products sufficiently to allow everyone sufficient milk and milk products needed for adequate, healthful diets by increased use of milk in schools, the Armed Forces, welfare institutions, and through a food-stamp plan for low-income families.

Third. That farmers be authorized and enabled to regulate their sale of milk so that sales slightly in excess of the needs for adequate, healthful diets will not result in bankrupting the farmers.

Fourth. That we also give farmers the authority, if the Federal Government fails to meet its obligations under the Full Employment Act of 1946 to maintain full employment, or to expand the consumption of milk by low-income people, to regulate their marketing so as to avoid bankruptcy prices.

Fifth. That prices to farmers be protected at a fair level against fluctuations in supply and demand by the use of production-adjustment payments of the difference between the market price and the agreed-upon support price, and when a slight temporary surplus of dairy marketing occur, that this be sold in the market at lower prices to consumers with the loss to farmers made up with production payments. Doing this would eliminate the need for the Government to pay storage charges.

PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS ALONG WITH MARKETING QUOTA PLAN EXPLAINED

Essentially, the provisions of my bill, H. R. 4360, in accordance with these overall aims, are as follows:

First. That we ask the dairy farmers to reduce their marketings from 3 to 5 percent to eliminate about half of the milk and milk products which are not clearing the market at present price levels.

Second. That we let the price of milk and milk products drop a little in the market so consumers will use more butter, cheese, milk, and other dairy products; this would allow consumption of the other half of the so-called surplus.

Third. That we give the farmers a production adjustment payment of the difference between the market price and agreed-upon price-support level.

Fourth. That we eliminate totally the need for Government storage of the dairy surplus.

There has been opposition to the use of production payments in our price-support programs in the past because of the sums which would have to be appropriated to make the payments on an uncontrolled production. Such costs can be controlled and held to whatever level Congress decrees, with the use of quotas and adjustment payments in combination.

A study has been made of the possibilities and prospective costs of combined use of adjustment payments and quotas. Congress can write its own ticket. If we would add about \$225 million next year to what we are paying for dairy products to go into storage, and farmers would reduce their marketing 4 to 5 percent, we could support dairy farm income at 90 percent of parity and give the consumers a considerable price break at the same time. We would also eliminate the need for the Government to pay storage charges on unused dairy products.

Support at lower levels would, of course, cost somewhat less, but in my judgment it would be very foolish to economize at the expense of farmers who are already in an economic depression dangerous to our whole national economy. Dairy farmers should not be required to take prices anything below 90 percent of parity. In my judgment, they are entitled to a full 100 percent of a fair and reasonable computation of parity.

HOW MARKETING QUOTAS WOULD WORK

I would like to describe just how the proposed marketing quotas on milk would work out for an individual farmer whose production is characteristic of most of the farmers in my district in Wisconsin.

Let us assume that Farmer Olson sold 200,000 pounds of milk in the base period, and that a 4-percent cut for 1956 is required by the quota.

This farmer would then be eligible to sell 192,000 pounds of milk and to receive production payments on them.

If the average market price for milk were 10 percent below parity on the support price in effect for the year, and the farmer's sale slips showed that he got an average of \$3 per hundredweight, he would receive a gross income of \$6,394. He would get \$5,760 directly by sale in the market of his 192,000 pounds quota at the market price of \$3 per hundredweight. In addition, he would get a direct production adjustment payment of \$634, giving him a total gross income of \$6,394.

If, however, he decided to sell his entire production of 200,000 pounds, he would not be eligible to receive any production adjustment payments. He would also be required to pay a penalty on the 8,000 pounds of milk sold in excess of his marketing quota. If the penalty were set at 75 percent of the support price, it would amount to \$2.50 per hundred, or a total penalty on the 8,000 pounds of excess sales of \$200. His gross income would then be \$5,800, figured by subtracting the penalty of \$200 from his market receipts of \$6,000 for sale of 200,000 pounds of milk at the market price of \$3 per hundredweight.

For example, it will be seen that it would be to the advantage of the farmer to comply with his marketing quota. If

he did so, he would get a gross income for the year of \$6,394, contrasted to only \$5,800 which he would get by not complying with his quota. The \$6,394 gross income under such a program would compare favorably also with the \$6,000 gross income he would get in an unsupported market for his full production of 200,000 pounds of milk at the market price of \$3 per hundredweight.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as I have stated before, I introduced H. R. 4360 to try to find out what the dairy farmer wants. If he does not want to accept marketing quotas and is satisfied with Mr. Benson's sliding scale for dairy farmers, I want to know it. Sixty-one percent of the dairy farmers in my district voted for me in 1953, and sent me to Congress. Sixty-three percent voted for me in 1954. I would assume from this large vote they wanted me to come to Washington to help them work out a solution to their problems. Since coming to Congress in January 1954, I have tried to find a solution and have worked hard in their behalf. I can honestly say that the 6 months I have been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Dairy Subcommittee we have not received one suggestion from our present Secretary of Agriculture, except when he testified before our committee and told us that the flexing of dairy farmers is working fine and he is well satisfied.

H. R. 4360 is my own brainchild and was introduced, as I have stated before, as a result of conferences with members of the Agriculture Committee from various sections of the United States. Many people have told me I am sticking my political neck out in coming forward with this plan, and already certain of the large processors have been circulating incorrect information concerning this bill.

If the dairy farmers are opposed to it, I would be the last one to urge it on them, and will immediately begin to search for another way out of the dairy farmers' dilemma. But I do not propose to have Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Beatrice Creameries, Fairmont Foods Co., or Kraft Food Products tell me what the dairy farmer wants. I hope that during the coming months it will be possible for me to determine what the dairy farmer wants. I would like to hear from them, and I want to receive their views. I also hope that before the next session convenes the Dairy Subcommittee will be able to hold hearings in all the dairy areas of the country to find out how the dairy farmers feel about this. I also hope my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who are not members of the Dairy Subcommittee will accompany the subcommittee for these hearings so they can hear the dairy farmer's testimony as to what he wants. I further hope that if such hearings are held the farmer will appear and make his views known.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend from Missouri, a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is to be commended on the excellent statement which he has just made, which

is typical of the commonsense, realistic stand he has taken in his efforts to solve the problems of the dairy farmers whom he so effectively and intelligently represents.

To begin with he has demonstrated that he has a clearcut view of the problem and is facing it in a most realistic manner. I say this because he has recognized that in return for the benefits to be derived from any support program, the producer must agree to cooperate in that program. Those farmers who produce the so-called basic commodities that have been supported at 90 percent of parity have agreed to production controls and marketing quotas, and it is only on this basis that anyone can justify the continuation of a fixed support program which will insure to the producer at least 90 percent of parity.

I know that our colleague from Wisconsin, who has been fighting so determinedly and so persistently for the farmers of his district whose livelihood is so dependent upon a fair price for their dairy products, has done much to convince the members of the Committee on Agriculture not only of his sincerity and his determination to bring about economic relief for the people of his district, but also of his ability to make worthwhile contributions to the solution of all of the perplexing problems with which this committee is faced.

Through the introduction of legislation which would contribute immensely to relieving a situation which has been made worse through the administration of the present program conceived by an administration that has failed to live up to its promises, the gentleman from Wisconsin has brought to the attention of the committee suggestions which, if enacted into law, would undoubtedly bring about greater prosperity to those areas wherein dairying is the major industry, but would also make available to the American people abundant supplies of all dairy products at prices which would be fair to the consumer.

It is my belief that if those producers who depend upon dairying for their livelihood will continue to put their trust in this capable and energetic Representative who has so effectively been dramatizing their story to the other Members of Congress, that they will in a comparatively short time begin to see the visible results of his campaign and begin to reap the benefits from a sound workable program based upon the theory that the American farmer is entitled to a fair share of the consumer's dollar and that he is entitled to all of those benefits which come from a soundly conceived price-support program resulting not only in 90 percent of parity, but the full parity as promised by candidate Eisenhower, but which apparently has been forgotten by President Eisenhower who appears to be sitting idly by while his duly appointed Secretary of Agriculture refuses to recognize the problem, and in failing to even recognize the problem, certainly can offer no suggestions for its solution.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Texas,

a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on his fine presentation. He is an ardent champion of the dairy industry, which happens to be of great interest and importance in my district. The gentleman was kind enough to visit Texas with me earlier this summer, and if the Agriculture Committee visits Wisconsin, I shall certainly make every effort to return the courtesy to him and his people. He learned much about our rice and cotton industry, and I want to improve my knowledge of his dairy problems. Like him, I want to hear what the farmers themselves want.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the very fine fight he has made for the dairy farmer and the dairy industry, in Congress. I do not know of any Member who is more on the alert, to be of help and aid and assistance to the dairy industry than the gentleman from Wisconsin. Ever since he came to Congress he has been working in behalf of the dairy industry and in the interest, I will say, of the plain people particularly. I commend him for the wonderful fights he has always made here on the floor of this House in that respect. He is a real and genuine friend of small business and a valuable and effective Member of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN], for those kind words. I would like to say to the gentleman that he was one of the first Members I met when I came to Washington, and I have valued his counsel very much.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I commend the gentleman on the statement he is making and commend his district on having a Representative in Congress who works as diligently in the interests of the dairy farmer as anyone I have even known, not only diligently but intelligently and effectively.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Virginia, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made here today. It is a real pleasure to serve on the Committee on Agriculture with him. I know of no man who is more sincere and more industrious than he, and who has the interest of all the farm families of the United States, and especially those families out in his section, the dairy families, more at heart.

May I say to the gentleman it will give me pleasure, as serving on the subcommittee with him pertaining to these dairy matters has, to meet in his district and study these problems firsthand. When the occasion arises, he may be sure I will be present.

Again I commend the gentleman on the fine and unselfish effort he is giving to the constituents of his district as well as to the other farm families and the people of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my esteemed colleague and member of the Agriculture Committee the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I also have listened with a great deal of interest to the talk the gentleman from Wisconsin has been giving us. I remember when the gentleman came here not so long ago, he had hardly been here a month before he was in the well of the House making a talk for the farmers in his district, and he was placing particular emphasis on the problems of the dairy farmers. I have served with the gentleman on the Committee on Agriculture and on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I am particularly impressed with the way the gentleman has insisted that the committee go to his district and get the grassroots problem. I hope it will be possible for me to go there and to be with him. I commend the gentleman on the stand that he is making for the dairy farmers and the other people in his great district in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman and I hope he will be able to come to Wisconsin with the Committee on Agriculture.

A STUDY IN SHORT MEMORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of The Great Conspiracy of 1933: A Study in Short Memories, by Paul F. Boller, Jr., that is published in the Southwest Review, spring 1954 edition, is particularly interesting now since the late Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was instrumental in getting Russia recognized by the United States. He is mentioned very favorably a number of times in this particular article. The subject, Short Memories, is a good one. Many of the people who are now criticizing those who caused the recognition of Russia were among those who were advocating it at that time. Readers of this article will be surprised to discover some of their names.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the article as follows:

THE "GREAT CONSPIRACY" OF 1933: A STUDY IN SHORT MEMORIES

(By Paul F. Boller, Jr.)

On the 10th of October 1933—7 months after assuming office—President Franklin Roosevelt sent off a note to Mikhail Kalinin, President of the All-Union Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics, calling attention to the desirability of an effort to end the present abnormal relations between 125 million people in the United States and the 160 million people of Russia. Adding that it was regrettable that the two countries should now be without a practical method of communicating with each other, Roosevelt invited Kalinin to send a representative to Washington to discuss outstanding questions at issue between the two nations. A few days later the Soviet President accepted Roosevelt's invitation and designated Maxim Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, as emissary to the United States. Early the following month, Commissar Litvinov arrived in New York, proceeded to Washington where he was greeted at Union Station by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and immediately paid a ceremonial visit to Franklin Roosevelt.

Negotiations to remove what Litvinov called "that artificial barrier which has for 16 years prevented normal intercourse between the peoples of our two countries" proceeded swiftly. There were a few days of conferences at the White House and at the State Department, interspersed with luncheons and dinners honoring Litvinov. Then, late in the night of November 16, the President and the Commissar, with State and Treasury Department officials present, brought their discussions to a close and exchanged five sets of diplomatic notes. The next day Roosevelt announced to nearly 200 correspondents who packjammed his White House office that at 10 minutes before midnight on November 16, 1933, the United States Government had finally resumed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union after a lapse of 16 years.

In this fashion, according to a theory now being sedulously advanced in certain quarters of this country, was the great conspiracy consummated. From the day of recognition, it appears, we can trace all the present troubles of the United States and the woes of the world at large. More than any other single factor, so the new thesis now circulating runs, it was recognition of the Soviet Union in late 1933 that gave the steadily disintegrating Bolshevik regime a new lease on life and started it off on its program of worldwide imperialist expansion. And who was responsible for this great act of betrayal? Why, Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal crowd, of course. Roosevelt "took action virtually on his own, rejecting the counsel of elder statesmen who thought we should wait awhile before opening our doors to Soviet diplomats," declared Bascom N. Timmons, columnist for the Dallas Times Herald, on November 17, 1953. "Russia was recognized solely because Franklin D. Roosevelt as President insisted upon it," stated a Dallas Morning News editorial 2 days later.

At the very least, according to present-day critics of Roosevelt's action 20 years ago, the New Deal "brain trust" was "soft" toward communism, filled with ecstasy at the prospect of doing business with Soviet leaders; at the worst, Roosevelt and his associates were coconspirators with the Kremlin, prepared to go to any lengths to welcome a pariah among nations back into the respectable world community and to facilitate the dissemination of Communist propaganda within the United States. No sensible, God-fearing, patriotic American, the theory goes, would have touched this international outlaw with a 10-foot pole in 1933. But here, as elsewhere, the American people were helpless victims of New Deal machinations. And we have been paying a heavy price for this folly—or treachery—ever since.

So far as I can discover, this new thesis regarding Soviet recognition was first put forward in the pages of the American Mercury during the campaign year of 1952. "The gravest charge against the Democratic Party," wrote Mercury Editor William Brad-

ford Hule in September 1952, "Is that it allowed evil and naive men within it to convert it into a vehicle which aided the growth of Soviet Russia and the extension of Soviet power." It is a "historic fact," he observed, that it started on its iniquitous course "when it championed recognition of the Soviet Union" in 1933.

A corollary to the Roosevelt-New Deal recognition-conspiracy thesis has been developed by William F. Buckley, Jr., a recent Yale alumnus whose *God and Man at Yale* raised a minor tempest at his alma mater in 1951. In an article for the March 1952 *Mercury* entitled "The Colossal Flunk," the zealous young fact finder produced another exposé: "How our professors have betrayed the American people." The outstanding example of betrayal by the American professoriate occurred, according to Buckley, on "that day in November 1933 when the President of the United States . . . clasped the hand of Maxim Litvinoff and extended full diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union." Buckley poses this searching question:

"Now whose responsibility was it to confront Franklin Roosevelt with the available and overwhelming evidence that this capricious act was nothing more than an invitation to the Comintern to set up in the United States hemispheric headquarters for a violent revolutionary movement . . . ?"

The answer is self-evident: "The responsibility sat squarely on the shoulders of the academic community." Yet, Buckley continues sorrowfully:

"A survey of the literature of the day reveals hardly a dissenting wavelength originating from the Nation's ivory towers. The reverse, in fact, was the case: The academic journals of the period treated compassionately and even encouragingly American recognition, which served immeasurably to fortify Stalin's then faltering domestic position. . . . [This was the] academic betrayal of 1933."

Well, as Al Smith used to say, let's take a look at the record. Let's attempt to do what presumably Bascom Timmons, the anonymous *Dallas News* editorial writer, William Bradford Huie, and William Buckley did before citing their various charges: examine the record. We might, in fact, begin by taking a look at Al Smith's own record. True, he was a liberal of a sort, and thus suspect; but he was never actually a full-fledged New Dealer, and in 1940 he finally broke completely with Roosevelt. Furthermore, he remained a devout Roman Catholic throughout his life. He was never, so far as I know, accused of subversion or even of creeping socialism. Seven months before Roosevelt's overtures to Kallinin—a few days before Roosevelt's inauguration, to be exact—Smith appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and announced flatly: "I believe that we ought to recognize Russia; I do not know any reason for not doing it." The crowd that jammed the committee room, with spectators standing two apiece on chairs, listened intently as the popular, cigar-smoking, brown-derbed New Yorker explained his views:

"Somebody says they owe us \$100 million. We kept troops in Russia for quite a while when we were not at war with them (a reference to Allied intervention in North Russia and Siberia, 1918–20), and we did some damage to them. I think we could sit around the table and settle that matter very easily.

"There is no use in trading with them under cover. We are doing it. Through the Amtorg, or whatever you call it, the Russian trading company, our material and stuff is getting into Russia.

"We might just as well be represented there and let them be represented here at Washington and let us do business with them in the open."

Smith made it clear that he had no use for the Soviet form of government, but he insisted that bolshevism presented no real threat to the American system.

"I do not think myself that they are making any headway with this communism. If there would be any place where you would see some of it, you would see it in a city like New York, and it does not mean anything down there. New York is contented. The people are satisfied. They are suffering, but they are satisfied.

"Now and then down in Union Square there are a half a dozen crackpots jump up on the platform and holler out at the people, but that has been going on down there since I was a boy."

Most newspapers appeared to agree with Smith. It is "a stupid policy that has for all these years kept the Russian market closed to us," commented the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*. The *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot* found it "a pleasure to see Al blow away the cobwebs." Urging immediate recognition, the *New York World-Telegram* asserted that "Russia is the only place we can get a large foreign market quickly for so much of our surplus production—and a market which has the unusual distinction in these times of never defaulting on its trade payments." The *Providence News-Tribune* saw advantages from recognition going far beyond benefits to American trade:

"There is a good deal to be said for the point of view that closer connection between the people of Russia and the peoples of what are called the capitalistic countries would result in the Soviet system going under rather than otherwise. Wild blood is not tamed or taught to be man's friend instead of his enemy by being left to roam and rave through its native jungle."

Surveying newspaper response as a whole throughout the country, the *Literary Digest* concluded that the "majority of editors" sided with Al.

There is no question but that the generally sympathetic reaction to Smith's recommendations represented an almost complete transformation of American attitudes toward the Soviet Union from those prevailing in the years immediately following the Bolshevik Revolution. The American people, from President Wilson on down, had greeted with unanimous enthusiasm the collapse of czarist autocracy in March 1917, and its replacement by a provisional government based upon constitutional democratic principles. But their optimism had given way first to bewilderment and then to dismay when, the following November, the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky overthrew the Kerensky government and proclaimed a communistic dictatorship. As the Bolsheviks proceeded, in rapid succession, to sign a separate peace with Germany, repudiate all Russian debts, organize the Third Communist International, and consolidate their power within Russia by "Red terror," American opinion changed quickly to indignation and revulsion. Thus when the Bolsheviks attempted in June 1918, and again in March 1919, to establish formal diplomatic relations with the United States, there was general support in the country for President Wilson's stern refusal to have anything to do with them. In explaining why the United States "recolls" from recognition, Bainbridge Colby, Wilson's Secretary of State, defined the official American attitude toward the Soviet regime in August 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, and every usage and convention, underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals."

Nonrecognition was about the only policy to survive the Harding landslide in 1920, and

it became the fixed policy of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, despite repeated efforts by the Soviets to resume diplomatic relations with each new administration.

It is important to note, however, that diplomatic nonrecognition did not mean economic nonrecognition during these years. In 1920 Washington lifted its ban on commercial relations with the Soviets, and American business firms began at once to enter into trade agreements with unofficial Soviet representatives in the United States. Many firms negotiated contracts with Amtorg Trading Co. providing for adjustment of claims arising out of Soviet confiscations of American property during the revolution. Others, like General Electric, General Motors, Standard Oil, and International Harvester, granted sizable commercial credits to the Soviets for relatively long terms, while the Chase National Bank and Equitable Trust Co. financed short-term loans for the purchase of American cotton. Even Hamilton Fish, who in the 1890's, as Republican Congressman from New York, was to be a leading antirecognitionist, took a trip to Russia and returned to tell the New York *Kiwanis* that Russia offered great business opportunities. As late as March 1926 he was still interested enough to introduce a resolution in Congress urging President Coolidge to create a commission composed of representatives of—

"The manufacturing, commercial, financial, agricultural, and exporting and importing interests of the United States, together with Government officials, which would endeavor to reopen trade and commercial relations with the people of Russia with a view to the resumption of trade and commerce and for the exchange of missions, pending the settlement of political relations between the two countries."

Despite the absence of governmental encouragement, however, American-Russian trade increased steadily during the 1920's, and by 1928 the United States was exporting three times as much to Russia as it had in 1913. Then in 1928–29, when Russia launched its first 5-year plan—a program for heavy industrial development and agricultural collectivization dependent, to an important extent, on imports from abroad—there was a sharp rise in American exports to the Soviets. By 1930 the United States had become the chief exporter to the Soviet Union, and the Soviets had become the world's largest purchaser of American agricultural and industrial equipment.

Furthermore, during the late 1920's American firms began sending engineers, technicians, and industrial experts to Russia to provide technical assistance on Soviet projects; and by 1930 some 30 firms, including Du Pont, Ford, General Electric, RCA, and Sperry Gyroscope, were participating in such arrangements. Reversing the process, Henry Ford invited Russian engineers to come to America to study so that they might "perfect themselves" in the techniques of mass production. Infuriated at the friendly relations developing between American business and the Soviets, Father Charles E. Coughlin, of Detroit, accused Henry Ford, along with the Chase National Bank and J. P. Morgan ("which is not certainly an American institution"), of "subsidizing" bolshevism, while Ralph M. Easley, chairman of the American Civic Federation, began calling Standard Oil's Ivy L. Lee "comrade" and concluded angrily that the growing rapprochement between the two countries was a matter of "plain dollars and cents."

Plain dollars and cents undoubtedly played a major role in the gradual development of sentiment for recognition in the years before 1933. Ivy Lee remarked that "the most significant fact about the present Russian regime was the personal honesty of the men in charge."

Returning from a visit to Russia, James D. Mooney, vice president of General Motors, declared that "the initiation of full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Republics was necessary in the interest of the development of normal trade relations." A poll taken in May 1932 of 50 firms dealing with Russia revealed that 22 favored immediate recognition and that only 4 were definitely opposed. Among those who spoke out in favor of recognition were the presidents of Sullivan Machinery Co., of Chicago, and C. O. Bartlett & Sons Co., of Cleveland, Edward A. Filene, of William Filene's Sons Co., of Boston, and the Commonwealth Club, of San Francisco, a business organization, which passed a resolution favoring recognition. "What about Russia?" queried *Business Week* in June 1932. "Washington has refused consistently to deal with the question. Business is more friendly." The views of corporation lawyer Paul D. Cravath doubtless reflected those of an increasingly larger segment of the American business and financial world during the late 1920's and early 1930's. Insisting that recognition does not remotely involve approval of Soviet principle and methods, Cravath declared:

"The obvious advantages of a policy of recognition are those upon which the whole system of diplomatic relations between civilized nations is based. Our Government would be in a position through its diplomatic representatives to protect, life, liberty, and property of Americans visiting, or sojourning, in Russia, of whom there are already several thousand annually, who are now dependent upon the good offices of the diplomatic representatives of other governments. Our Government would be able by the usual diplomatic methods to encourage and protect American trade with Russia. There is much force in the view that when—our Government—encouraged American merchants and manufacturers to engage in trade with Russia, it owed our citizens the duty of protecting this trade by the usual diplomatic machinery. * * * With an Ambassador at Moscow and consuls in the principal trading centers of Russia, our Government would be able to assemble reliable information for the guidance of our merchants, manufacturers, and bankers."

As American business moved steadily in the direction of recognition during the early 1930's, it was joined by a similar movement in the press and in politics. In the spring of 1932 Roy Howard, president of Scripps-Howard Newspaper Service, began a recognition campaign in his influential newspaper chain. "I think the menace of bolshevism in the United States is about as great as the menace of sunstroke in Greenland or chibblains in the Sahara," he told the vice president of the Chase National Bank. Beginning in 1930, Senator William E. Borah, Republican, Idaho, who had been a steadfast advocate of recognition throughout the 1920's, was supported in his views by an increasing number of senatorial colleagues. Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat, Montana, declared that by "all the rules of international law and practice, they are entitled to recognition." Democrats like Senators Barkley, Ladd, Pittman, and Robinson, and Republicans like Senators Cutting, Johnson, Brookhart, La Follette, Norris, and Nye added their voices to the rising chorus.

It is clear by 1933 many of the arguments against recognition had lost much of their weight. Worldwide depression had forced most European nations to join Russia in defaulting on World War I debts to the United States, and the Russian debt began to seem far less important than formerly. In addition, the dollars and cents argument for recognition took on new meaning as the depression widened throughout the United States, and the prospect of recognition and increased trade began to appear more and more attractive as a means of helping to

pull the economy out of the doldrums. Trade with Russia, explained Thomas Campbell, a Montana mass production farmer, is one of the best ways to help terminate our industrial depression. Furthermore, the rise of Hitler in Germany and the threat of Japanese expansion in the Orient added a compelling new argument in favor of reconciliation with Russia: it might serve as a stabilizing factor in the precarious international situation.

Finally, fear of Communist propaganda had gradually waned throughout the period. After Stalin broke with Trotsky in 1926 and announced, "We have had enough of that idiotic slogan, the world revolution," it appeared to many Americans that Russia had abandoned its program of world revolution and was settling down to the far less menacing job of building socialism in one country. Communism in America, it was noted, was still a negligible factor; and in any case, the fundamental bulwark against communism was not nonrecognition but a strong and viable American system. "I have no sympathy with communism," said Gifford Pinchot, Republican Governor of Pennsylvania, "but I am not afraid of it nor of the recognition of Russia by this country." Senator Bronson Cutting, Republican, of New Mexico, even went so far as to welcome Communist propaganda: "In the battle of propaganda on both sides, in a battle where the facts could be made available to both sides, I have no doubt of the final issue." In January 1933, the *New York Times* reported that of 51 Senators polled, 22 favored recognition, 20 declined to commit themselves, and only 9 recorded their opposition. "Time and events," admitted the *Times*, long an opponent of recognition, "have been wearing down the obstacles standing in the way of correct relations between the United States and Soviet Russia."

It cannot be said, therefore, that Al Smith's remarks before the Senate committee in March 1933 were in any way unusual; nor is it surprising that the "majority of editors" considered his recommendations the plain commonsense of the matter. Joined by business and financial circles, the editors continued to "side with Al" as the United States moved steadily in the direction of recognition in the months following his appearance before the Senate. Early in July, *Time* reported that Litvinov, once accustomed to being snubbed by American Secretaries of State, "now hobnobs in friendly fashion" with Secretary Hull at the World Economic Conference then in session in London. Talk of recognition "grew serious," according to the *New York Times*, when it became known that William C. Bullitt, executive officer of the United States delegation, had an hour's talk with Litvinov, and that Senator James Couzens (Republican, Michigan) lunched with a second Soviet delegate, Valerie I. Mezhlank. Since this was not the first time that Bullitt had conferred with Litvinov at the London Conference, it appeared that "serious exploratory work" on the recognition problem was under way.

Out of the friendly hobnobbing in London came a "thumping deal" between Litvinov and Assistant Secretary of State Raymond Moley by which, said *Time*, "the soft opening wedge" for recognition was to be "a great wad of cotton." This deal was announced in Washington by Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: an RFC loan of \$4 million to the Soviet Union for the purchase of surplus cotton in the United States. This is "the first time since the World War," noted the *Literary Digest*, "that the Government sanctions a business deal with Russia." There was general agreement that the RFC loan constituted "informal recognition" of Russia. Within a few weeks the RFC had received some 40 requests for further loans to enable Ameri-

can manufacturers to sell to Russia on credit. With some amusement, the *Nation*, a liberal weekly which, along with the *New Republic*, had favored recognition since the early 1920's, printed a cartoon in which an American businessman, confronted by a Russian with hat in hand, is saying to a woman representing the American press: "Be nice to him, dear."

Both the press and the business world were extremely nice to him. So, too, were the politicians. When, on October 20, the text of the Roosevelt-Kalinin exchange was released to the press, the *New York Times* ran a story on the first page headed: "Roosevelt's Move Wins Wide Backing. Most of the Senators and Representatives Commenting Favor the Step." Among those expressing themselves as in favor of the move were Senators Elmer Thomas, Democrat, of Oklahoma; George McGill, Democrat, of Kansas; and Kenneth McKellar, Democrat, of Tennessee. Senator Robert Reynolds, Democrat, of North Carolina, was joined by Senator James Couzens, Republican, of Michigan, in calling for immediate and full recognition. Arriving from Europe, Senator William G. McAdoo, Democrat, of California, recalled that he had long favored recognition. His colleague, Senator Hiram Johnson, Republican, of California, thought recognition would be wise, sensible, and statesmanlike. Speaker of the House Henry A. Rainey, Democrat, of Illinois, declared the recognition would open an outlet for our surplus goods. Senator Cutting brushed aside fears of Soviet propaganda by quoting Karl Radek: "Revolutions are not carried in suitcases. They cannot be imported; they grow."

Like the Senators, American bankers and businessmen, according to the *Times*, were particularly interested in the development of trade relations that would follow recognition. Many of them felt that the potentialities of trade with this economically youthful country were unlimited. To reassure those who were still wavering on the recognition issue, officials of General Electric and RCA, both of which have had large dealings with the Soviet, announced that at all times their relations with Soviet Russia have been eminently satisfactory. Reversing its previous stand, the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, whose membership included leading business and banking houses, came out for recognition. The United States Board of Trade took similar action.

The city of Seattle was especially excited by the prospects: "Seattle Sees Trade Boom" was the front-page headline in the *New York Times*. "Shipping men, port authorities and other business heads" forecast "the opening of a new trade era" for the city. The president of the Pacific National Bank and the Seattle Clearing House Association was quoted as saying that recognition might open the door for "large transactions" and that Seattle, the closest American ship to Vladivostok, would see a revival of shipping.

Newspaper editors sided as energetically with Roosevelt in October as they had with Al Smith in March. "Sensible and sober men," said the *Baltimore Sun*, will regard Roosevelt's invitation to Kalinin with undivided approval. All over the country, such papers as the *Hartford Courant*, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, the *Kansas City Star*, the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, the *Des Moines Tribune*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and the *Portland Oregonian* expressed similar sentiments. The United States should properly be on friendly terms with Russia and aid in its industrial development, said the *Dallas News*. It should enable it also to retain its place as a Pacific power, thus checking to some extent Japanese ambitions in the Far East.

In Collier's, Ray Tucker welcomed Roosevelt's move as a return to sensible relations and an important stimulant to trade. *Time*

saw in Kalinin's swift response to Roosevelt 2 or 3 triumphs for the President:

(1) Never before had the Soviets agreed to discuss differences with a sovereign power before their own sovereignty was recognized. (2) Upon excited Europe and the Far East * * * the drawing together of Russia and the United States must have a quieting effect. (3) The quieting effect upon United States domestic excitements was instant and undisputed.

In the Literary Digest, Ernest K. Lindley asserted that nonrecognition was an "anomaly which has seemed grotesque to an increasing number of people." "With the future of its own great domestic experiment at stake," wrote Lindley, "the Soviet influence has been overwhelmingly on the side of peace." William Phillips Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign editor, agreed with Lindley that time had vastly modified objections to recognition. "The real value of the meeting in Washington," said Business Week, "will be the agreement of the two countries to carry on trade relations on a normal basis. If this be provided, business will do much for itself in the development of trade with the Soviet Union."

The Washington Daily News summed up much of the prevailing opinion in a cartoon picturing Uncle Sam in bed, "Waking up at last," as a telephone labeled "Russia" jingles merrily to the tune of "Trade Opportunities." And the Kansas City Star ridiculed fears of Communist propaganda in a cartoon which showed Uncle Sam and Russia smiling at each other across a fence on which hangs a sign reading "Quarantine: Revolutionary Measles." Russia is pointing to the sign; but Uncle Sam, holding a brief case loaded with "Orders," beams back: "I've already had it—in a mild form." The caption: "He surely won't catch it now."

There were, to be sure, a number of vigorous protests as Litvinov arrived in Washington and went into a huddle with Roosevelt and Hull. Senator David A. Reed (Republican, Pennsylvania) was "awfully sorry" about it; the Washington Star favored recognition only if Russia promised not to carry on "subversive agitation" in the United States; the Los Angeles Times favored it only if Russia was willing to "behave in an internationally civilized manner." A group calling itself the Paul Revere's telegraphed a protest to the White House; Edward A. Hayes, national commander of the American Legion, deplored the negotiations—though Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas assured Roosevelt that not more than 5 percent of the Legion membership would be antagonized by recognition—and the American Alliance, headed by Maj. Gen. Mark L. Hersey, Ely Culbertson, Bishop James E. Freeman, Martin Littleton, Nathan D. Perlman, Rabbi Abram Simon, Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, and Grover Whalen, announced a series of radio programs to oppose recognition. The American Federation of Labor sent Roosevelt a long document containing a "damning indictment" of recognition, reasserting the fixed policy of William Green, Matthew Woll, and other A. F. of L. leaders toward the Soviet Union since 1917.

But these were minor ripples compared to the tidal wave of opinion favoring Roosevelt's action. Shortly before Litvinov's arrival in Washington, the American Foundation published a long report urging recognition. Signers of the report included, among others, James D. Mooney, president of the General Motors Export Co.; Thomas S. Gates, president of the University of Pennsylvania; Thomas W. Lamont of J. P. Morgan & Co.; George M. Houston, president of Baldwin Locomotive Works; Roscoe Pound, dean of the Harvard School of Law; Gen. William N. Haskell of the National Guard of New York; J. H. Rand, Jr., president of Remington Rand Corp.; Thomas A. Morgan, president of Curtis Wright; Dr. Walter G.

Alvarez of the Mayo Clinic; and Judge Curtis Bok, of Philadelphia. At the same time, the foundation announced that in a poll it had taken of 1,139 dailies in the country, 63 percent had voted for recognition, 2.6 percent favored it with qualifications, and only 26.9 percent were opposed. A breakdown of the figures indicated that the greatest sentiment for recognition was to be found in the South and in the large eastern States, with the greatest opposition appearing in New England. In an analysis of the political complexion of the newspapers, Editor and Publisher reported that the favorable vote did not reflect party lines. The position of the Dallas News may be taken as typical of the views of two-thirds of American newspapers at this time:

"President Roosevelt returns to the older theory of recognition that a government is entitled to recognition if it is in full possession of the government, if it is able to maintain order and protect life and property, and if its rule is acquiesced in by the people. Russia fulfills these conditions and all that now remains is to reach agreements respecting debts and pledges against propaganda. These agreements can be made in principle and details worked out through appointed commissions.

"Some object to recognition on the ground that Russia's system of government is communistic and in general antireligious. Internationally, however, each state in theory has the right to determine its own form of government and sphere of activity. * * * The general opinion in this country is that Russia and the United States should resume normal and diplomatic relations, since they have many common interests, especially in the Far East, and can readily develop trade relations, mutually profitable."

To the Dallas News, Russia was "Just Another Customer." A News cartoon portrayed a Russian woman waiting before the counter of a general store to make her purchases while Uncle Sam, the clerk, tells two protesting women (the A. F. of L. and the DAR): "Listen! I ain't goin' to marry the gal!"

While probably not everyone agreed with Stanley High that Litvinov was "the leading candidate for the current year's Nobel Peace Award," the Commissar met, in general, an extremely warm reception in this country. "The thing that has amazed me," commented Oswald Garrison Villard in the Nation, "is that there has been no terrific outburst of protest from the Daughters of the Revolution, the Sons of the Revolution, Ham Fish, or Ralph M. Easley. I thought they would be holding mass meetings at Carnegie Hall." Somewhat disappointedly, he added: "But there hasn't been a peep from them."

When Litvinov reached Washington, the Roosevelt administration was fully prepared to get down to brass tacks. The question of recognition had been given thoughtful and serious consideration for many months. Letters favoring or disapproving recognition had been accumulating in the right-hand drawer of Secretary Hull's desk from his very first day in office; in addition, he had been receiving one delegation after another with views to express on the matter. From the very beginning Hull had felt that "certain conditions" had arisen which had not been "fully present under previous administrations" and that the Russian question merited fresh consideration. As he told Molotov, 9 years later, after the United States had entered World War II,

"When I came to the State Department, in 1933, I recommended recognition of the Soviet Government on several important grounds. Probably the most important was the great need and opportunity for cooperation between our two Governments during the years ahead for the purpose of promoting and preserving conditions of peace in the

world. My further grounds were the traditional friendship between the peoples of the 2 countries and the fact that it was contrary to the best interests of 2 great nations such as the Soviets and ourselves not to be on speaking terms diplomatically in view of the existing circumstances in the international field."

At the London Economic Conference in June and July, Hull discussed the subject elaborately with a number of Foreign Ministers attending the meeting, and he also conferred with Litvinov, whom he found a "thoroughly capable diplomat and international statesman," with an "agreeable personality." Returning from London in August, Hull outlined in a memorandum to the President the problems involved in recognition. In his Memoirs (1948), he tells us:

"In some respects we stood to gain more than Russia by a restoration of diplomatic relations. Without relations, the Russians were probably much better informed about conditions in America than we were about the situation in Russia. * * * Moreover, it was easier for the Russians to do business in the United States without diplomatic protection than it was for Americans to do business in Russia."

Four points, he told Roosevelt, would have to be settled before any agreement could be reached with the Russians: (1) The question of Communist propaganda; (2) freedom of religion for United States citizens in Russia; (3) fair treatment of American citizens in Russia; and (4) settlement of the debts, both governmental and private, which were owed by Russia.

Satisfactory settlement of all four points mentioned by Hull in his memorandum was insisted upon by Roosevelt and his advisers before they would consent to grant formal recognition to the Soviet Union. According to William Bullitt, an "ardent proponent of recognition" (Hull) and a prime mover in the events of October and November, Litvinov, "after refusing to sign such agreements so persistently that he was handed a schedule of steamship sailings and told to sign or go home, did sign them on November 16, 1933, and we established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union." With respect to propaganda, Litvinov promised that it would be the "fixed policy" of his government to "refrain" from interference in American affairs. On the second point, Litvinov agreed that American citizens residing in Russia should be permitted "freedom of religious worship and exercise of ecclesiastical functions." In addition, Roosevelt prevailed upon Litvinov to accept, a long series of guarantees respecting the rights of Americans in Russia. The question of debts (and Russian counterclaims for damages done by American troops in northern Russia during the period of Allied intervention, 1918-20) was left to future negotiations. As a "goodwill gesture," Litvinov waived claims for damages done by American forces in Siberia during and after World War I.

Upon conclusion of the agreement, Roosevelt named William C. Bullitt, who had been working tirelessly for recognition since 1919 and who, as special assistant to Hull, had played a prominent part in the negotiations, as first Ambassador to the Soviet Union. "After 14 years his point was made" was the caption under Time's picture of the new Ambassador.

The immediate reactions to the recognition settlement were just about what we might expect. Moscow, not surprisingly, hailed it as Ochen horosho (very fine), although Pravda could not resist a dig at William Green—"that yellow trade-union bureaucrat"—for his bitter end opposition. In Episcopal Church House, Philadelphia, Archdeacon the Reverend James P. Bullitt, uncle of the new Ambassador, flared: "The United States has disgraced itself by establishing relations with a country which is beyond the

pale—a pariah among nations." Congressman Hamilton Fish denounced the "brain trust," and William Green reaffirmed AFL hostility to the Soviet regime. Most of the oppositionists, however, accepted the decision with resignation and hoped for the best. Edward Hayes, of the American Legion, received Roosevelt's announcement "with the spirit of the soldier"; the State Journal of Lincoln, Nebr., conceded that it "will be acceptable to a great majority"; and the Los Angeles Times expressed hope that it would "work out for the best interests of both countries."

In general, the American press greeted recognition with quiet satisfaction. Time reported that virtually all newspapers approved the agreement, or at least did not actively oppose it. Even such a formerly anti-recognitionist paper as the New York Herald Tribune could "express nothing but approval." A Dallas News cartoon captioned "Tea for Two" showed Uncle Sam and Uncle Joe enjoying a spot of tea together from a teapot filled with "Friendship and Trade." Roosevelt, observed the News, saw the absurdity of a continued refusal to recognize a great nation with a stable government. * * * Without question, the Nation as a whole will give sanction to this decision. Russia has a people of 160 million, occupying a large fraction of this earth's surface. In its civilization, it is Western, not Oriental, and it is certain to become within the next 25 years one of the greatest in the family of nations.

"After all, sovietism is an experiment in a sort of democracy. * * * There will be the exchange of ideas and of political and cultural experiences, as a result of which each, it is to be hoped, may gain knowledge and wisdom from the other. The two peoples should be fast friends in the future as they were in the past."

On the front page, the News announced on November 18: "Recognition aid to sale of Texas cotton in Russia. Millions of bales now expected to be sold to Soviet consumers." According to the News, the reluctance of Americans to do business with the Soviets owing to absence of diplomatic relations is now removed by the character of good standing which President Roosevelt's official announcement implies. For several months Jesse H. Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has been maneuvering to make possible large shipments of raw and manufactured products into this reservoir of trade. * * * Russia has always taken large amounts of Texas cotton which appeared to best serve its mill purposes. For instance in 1929 the Soviet bought nearly \$25 million worth of Texas cotton, and in the remainder of the South, the expenditure was only \$6 million. During the last 9 years Texas cotton to the value of about \$150 million has been purchased by that government.

"Mr. Roosevelt's recognition of the Soviet, according to the prevailing Washington opinion, will be one of the most important accomplishments of his administration when the history is written. The step will have the approval of the business world."

On the 19th, the News reported that Dallas expected "a marked business and industrial improvement" as a direct result of recognition. C. J. Crampton, executive secretary of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, was quoted as saying it "will certainly help our business." Others, like Sherwood H. Avery, secretary of the North Texas Foreign Trade Club, were of the same opinion.

The enthusiasm of Dallas for the economic benefits of recognition was duplicated in other parts of the country. Francis T. Cole, executive vice president of the American Manufacturers Export Association, made public a survey conducted among 400 manufacturers analyzing the promising opportu-

nities for business expected to follow from recognition and increased trade. C. W. Linscheid, president of the Export Managers' Club of New York, referred to recognition as "a distinct step forward." Similar statements were made by Samuel M. Vauclain, chairman of the board of Baldwin Locomotive Works, and Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., president of General Motors. A news story in the New York Times stated that Michigan was "likely to reap a financial harvest because of the expected demand for products, especially automobiles," and reported that George Feehan, of the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, had forecast a boom for American trade.

In Congress, the reaction was similarly favorable. Senator Borah, dean of the recognitionists, was so pleased that he telegraphed congratulations from Boise, Idaho, to both Roosevelt and Litvinov. Typical of lawmakers who foresaw excellent results in terms of foreign trade and world peace were Democratic Senators Reynolds, Black, Thomas (both Elbert D. and Elmer), and Robinson, and Republican Senators Nye and Capper. Speaker of the House Rainey called recognition the "greatest thing in the world that has happened to bring about world peace."

Busily rounding up opinion in leftist circles, the New York Times reported that Norman Thomas' Socialist Party approved of Roosevelt's action; in the opinion of the Socialists, the Comintern had been outlawed by Litvinov's pledge and the Communist Party dealt a death blow. The Times ran into some difficulty, however, when it attempted to get a statement from leaders of the American Communist Party. Recognition left the comrades "officially mute last night." At the offices of the Daily Worker, reporters were told that Earl Browder was "out of town. We don't know where, but may be back tomorrow." William Z. Foster was also out of town and nobody knew where he was. Robert Minor was "at a beach in Virginia, but what beach was not known." Sam Don, editor of the Worker, told reporters there would be no editorial on the subject that day and declined to comment further. Since at this time Roosevelt was, in the opinion of American Stalinists, "the most effective agent Wall Street has had in several years," his Cabinet "the new Wall Street hunger and war cabinet," and the NRA an "Industrial Slavery Act," the forerunner of "American fascism," the temporary bewilderment of the Communist Party, United States of America, over the new development is perhaps understandable. On this occasion, as on many others, the Kremlin had apparently not bothered to tip the American party off in advance, and the usually garrulous comrades were forced into one of their brief periods of silence pending official adjustment to the new line.

It is part of history, of course, that the high hopes that Americans entertained generally during 1933 for the future of American-Soviet relations failed of realization. Disillusionment began almost immediately in the months following recognition, and by the middle of 1935 had become quite widespread within administration circles as well as outside. In subsequent negotiations, the Soviets failed to agree on debt payments, and as a result the Roosevelt administration refused to extend credits through the Export-Import Bank (established in 1934 for that specific purpose) for Soviet purchases in this country. Though an increase in American-Soviet trade did develop after 1933, there was nothing like the trade boom anticipated by American business interests. Nor did Soviet leaders show any disposition to honor the pledge that Litvinov had made to refrain from interference in American internal affairs.

In the clear light of hindsight, this disillusionment may appear to have been inevitable. But it is impossible to escape the conclusion that Roosevelt's action on November 16, 1933, was heartily endorsed

by the American people as a whole. The sound and fury that arise periodically in this country upon occasions of major foreign policy decisions—entry into World War II, the recall of General MacArthur from the Far East, the question of recognizing Red China—seem to have been notably absent while the question of Soviet recognition was being decided.

The contention that Roosevelt "took action virtually on his own" is simply untrue. If Roosevelt had decided on recognition by September 1933, as Bullitt reports, he had been preceded in his decision by influential spokesmen in the American press, business, financial, and political circles. If we are to talk of betrayals 20 years ago, then we shall be forced to place business betrayal and newspaper betrayal at the top of the list. The lure of trade seems to have been the primary motivation for prorecognition sentiment in this country in the early 1930's; but the threat posed by Nazi Germany and imperialist Japan appears to have figured most prominently in the calculations of Roosevelt and his associates. By the early fall of 1933, according to Bullitt, "both the President and I were convinced that Hitler would eventually make war unless England, France, and the Soviet Union should stand together against Nazi aggression. It seemed in our national interest to prevent the outbreak of a Hitler war and, therefore, to resume relations somewhat skeptically with the Soviet Union. * * * The primary objective was to prevent the launching of another world war by Hitler."

It seemed nonsense, says Bullitt, for the United States to continue to snub Russia when "there seemed to be a faint possibility that we might obtain the cooperation of the Soviet Government for the preservation of peace in both Europe and Asia." It is difficult to see anything sinister in that; given the circumstances of 1933, it seemed, as isolationist Senator Hiram Johnson put it, "wise, sensible, and statesmanlike."

Maxim Litvinov's successful trip to the United States wound up on November 24 with what the Nation called "the most extraordinary dinner ever given in New York City." Some 2,500 persons paid \$5.50 a plate for a farewell dinner (which included Beluge caviar spread thin on toast, borsch, and filet of beef Stroganoff) at Manhattan's Waldorf-Astoria on the eve of Litvinov's sailing for home. Although no cardinal or other Catholic official was present, Time noted that the American Apostolic Church of America sent its chief prelate and that the big warm room buzzed with the voices of General Motors' Sloan; General Electric's Gerald Swope; Ford's Sorenson; Pennsylvania's Atterbury; Baldwin Locomotive's Houston; Thomas A. Edison's son, Charles; Theodore Roosevelt's son, Kermit; Owen D. Young; Henry Morgenthau, Sr.; and dowagers galore.

Mingling with the guests could also be found S. Parker Gilbert, of the firm of J. P. Morgan; Loomis, of the Lehigh Valley Railroad; Gordon Rentschler, of the National City Bank; the head of the New York Herald Tribune, and the president of the American Chamber of Commerce. The high point of the evening undoubtedly came when the guests stood and faced a stage behind which hung a huge American flag and the Red flag with the Soviet hammer and sickle while the organ played My Country, 'tis of Thee, and then switched into the Internationale. "Not a liberal editor appeared on the dais," observed the Nation ironically, "and hardly a man or woman who battled for Russian recognition when to do so was to invite contumely, insult, and abuse."

It would be nice if the expounders of the Roosevelt-recognition-conspiracy thesis would pause long enough in their current campaign of contumely, insult, and abuse to take a look at the Waldorf-Astoria's guest list for that gemütlich evening in New York City 20 years ago.

THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to read some records and documents and also read from my own manuscript.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, proceedings in the House are governed by the Constitution,¹ by the precedents established by Parliament,² and by the rules adopted by the House as each Congress convenes.³

Roberts' Rules of Order, the rules of any other body, give way when in conflict with the above.

Since coming here in 1935, an earnest effort has been made to familiarize myself with the Rules of the House and the precedents. But the subject is so broad that, as we meet here from day to day, there is difficulty, both when we are in Committee of the Whole and when we are in the House, in following the correct procedure.

As the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], has so often impressed upon us, the Rules of the House—if we are to retain the respect and confidence of the people—must be adhered to.

So that the House proceedings may be orderly, progressive, and efficient, a basic, fundamental rule of Parliament, and now of this House,⁴ authorizes any Member to make a point of order, and "it is a breach of order for the Speaker to refuse to put a question which is in order."⁵

On March 18, 1955, when the House had under consideration H. R. 4903, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] offered an amendment authorizing the construction of an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission, the following occurred—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3204 and 3205:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the emergency involved, and the urgent need of the facility for which the appropriation is proposed, the committee accepts this amendment and approves the expenditure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order does come too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How does it come too late when I was on my feet seeking

recognition before the gentleman was recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, as chairman of the committee, was recognized first. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the rule that requires recognition of the chairman of a committee would deprive another Member from making a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No. Did the gentleman address the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did address the Chair before the Clerk finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the proper time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was on my feet and addressed the Chair before the Clerk finished and as soon as he finished. Now, if I have to shout louder, I can do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not recognize the gentleman until the Clerk had finished reading.

The attention of my colleagues is called to the fact that one of the reasons given by the Chairman for his failure to recognize me to make the point of order was that my point of order came too late.

My contention is that the point of order did not come too late, because I was on my feet, seeking recognition, before the gentleman who objected to the point of order was recognized.

The Chairman apparently realized that to be the fact because he gave as his reason for his refusal to recognize me that the gentleman he did recognize was chairman of the committee.

Then, in reply to my inquiry as to whether that established procedure deprived another Member of the right to make a point of order, the Chairman replied in the negative and inquired as to whether I did address the Chair.

Having been advised that I had addressed the Chair, even before the Clerk finished reading, the Chairman then stated that that was not the proper time.

The Chairman was then advised that I was on my feet and addressed the Chair, not only before the Clerk finished reading but as soon as he finished.

It was apparent that I was entitled to recognition on a point of order, both while the Clerk was reading and after he finished.

It is axiomatic that one rising to a point of order and addressing the Speaker must be recognized, if orderly procedure is to prevail.

Even the reading of the Journal of the previous day's proceedings may be interrupted by a point of order.⁶

Moreover, every Member who has attended the sessions of the present Congress knows that the right to make a point of order has been recognized, not only when the Clerk is reading, when a Member is speaking, but during a rollcall.

If that were not the rule, disorder might prevent an understanding by the Members of what was transpiring on the floor.

YIELDING TIME

When, under a rule adopted by the House, the time for general debate has been fixed, control of the time is divided between the majority member in charge of the bill and the ranking minority member of the committee which reported it out.

Under the practice, the member in charge of the bill, usually the committee or subcommittee chairman, and the ranking minority member allocate the time available to those wishing to participate in the debate.

When the Committee of the Whole has a bill under consideration under the 5-minute rule, the practice has been for the Chairman to recognize members as they arose on the floor, giving priority of recognition to members of the committee which reported the bill for action and, in giving recognition, usually alternating between members of the two parties.

Thursday, June 16, the House had under consideration H. R. 6766, a very important appropriation bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], in charge of the bill, at a time when 42 Members were on their feet seeking recognition to participate in the debate on the Phillips amendment, secured, on motion, a limitation of debate to a period so brief that each had but 2 minutes.

The following proceedings then occurred:⁷

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a statement relative to the debate on this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The name of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is on the list, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman.

Under this recognition, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was entitled to the 2 minutes to which his motion had limited all who desired to participate in the debate on the Phillips amendment.

Immediately following that recognition, the RECORD shows the following:⁸

Mr. RABAUT. I want to announce that I shall object to anybody transferring their time.

Subsequently, in the debate on the Phillips amendment, and after the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had secured recognition for 2 minutes under the limitation imposed by the Rabaut motion, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] asked unanimous consent that the time allotted to him be transferred to his colleague.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] then announced:⁹

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I made the statement before anyone started to speak that no matter what the time allotment would be I should have to object to the transfer of time. Therefore I object.

After the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had exhausted his 2 minutes, in answer to his parliamentary inquiry:

Mr. HALLECK. Because the pattern was set, Mr. Chairman, in respect to yielding, would it not be proper at this time for anyone who wanted to yield to me, after he was recognized, to be so recognized in order that I might complete my statement?

The Chairman announced:

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the Chair has always alternated between the

¹ Jefferson Manual, secs. 1-281.

² Id., secs. 283-620.

³ Id., secs. 621-950.

⁴ Jefferson Manual, sec. 304.

⁵ Id.

⁶ Jefferson's Manual, sec. 621, p. 303.

⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8475.

⁸ Id.

⁹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8477.

sides and thinks in fairness that that precedent should be followed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

This ruling was in accordance with the procedure adopted by the motion limiting debate on the Phillips amendment and with the precedents heretofore established by the House.

After the gentleman from Tennessee had used his 2 minutes, the Chair then recognized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] for 2 minutes. On request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], Mr. BEAMER yielded, and when 2 minutes had been used, the Chair announced that the time of the gentleman had expired.

After several Members had been recognized and used the allotted 2 minutes, the Chairman recognized the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] who was one of those who were standing when the time for debate was limited. Then the majority leader arose and the following occurred:¹⁰

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, I do not want to ask him a question but I am going to ask my friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] if he will state to the Members that he has no objection to Members transferring their time to other Members if they desire to do so. I hope my friend from Michigan will do that.

Mr. RABAUT. I will do it.

This concession on the part of the gentleman in charge of the bill, Mr. RABAUT, permitted any one of the 42 Members who was on his feet when the limitation was adopted and who had not used the time allotted to yield his time to any other Member who was recognized for 2 minutes.

It is my understanding that this change in the attitude of the gentleman in charge of the bill was due to the fact that, if he insisted that the leaders on my left were to be limited to 2 minutes on a bill of this importance, it might thereafter, when debate was limited, be extremely difficult for even the Speaker to obtain, under similar circumstances—as he has obtained—as much as 15 minutes to participate in debate.

Undoubtedly the desire to promote comity between the parties was a controlling factor in inducing a change in the procedure.

The change in the procedure which followed the request made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was, however, subject to a point of order which might be raised by any Member.

The yielding of time by one who was, under the amendment, entitled to 2 minutes, was not, thereafter, during the debate, objected to, and the gentleman from Indiana, as did others, was able to secure additional, though limited, time.

Going back for a moment: Immediately after the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] had, by motion, obtained a limitation of time on debate on the Phillips amendment, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] offered a preferential motion. That motion was defeated.

A POINT OF ORDER

Then the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan, your humble servant, offered the preferential motion that the Committee rise, report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken. He was recognized, spoke 5 minutes in support of his motion, then asked unanimous consent to withdraw the motion. The following then occurred:¹¹

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized in opposition to the motion.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

If the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], desired to speak in opposition to the preferential motion just offered, he was, under the precedents, as chairman of the committee in charge of the bill and as a member of the opposite party, entitled to prior recognition. That ruling is not subject to criticism.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was recognized, but please note the following: When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a committee member in charge of the bill, was given a priority recognition, he rose in opposition to the preferential motion, and he added:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the preferential motion.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] then stated:

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] then yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Neither the Rules of the House nor those prevailing in committee, nor the practice of either, justifies a member of the committee in yielding his time to another member.

A sound reason for this is that the efficacy of the rule or practice which entitled a member of a committee or the chairman of a committee to priority of recognition would be completely destroyed if one entitled to such priority was permitted to indiscriminately forthwith yield the time granted him. The purpose of the rule as to priority of recognition would be defeated.

One speaking in debate can, of course, yield either for a question or an observation, but if objection is made he cannot transfer his time.

It cannot be forgotten that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] secured his recognition on two grounds, first, that he was opposed to the preferential motion offered by the Member from Michigan, and, second, that he was a member of the committee and that it was customary in debate to alternately recognize members of the two parties.

Under the rules, the only debate permissible at the time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was recognized was in opposition to the preferential motion. The gentleman securing recognition no doubt understood this, for he

specifically stated that he wished to address himself to the preferential motion.

If assuming, as we must, that at the time the only time which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] could yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] was the 5 minutes to which he was entitled, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] to be in order would be required to speak in opposition to the preferential motion—that if he did not speak in opposition to the preferential motion, then he was not entitled to the floor, unless he was speaking in lieu of a 2-minute talk by his colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. But that would not be proper, because the only question then before the committee was on the preferential motion.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], having been yielded to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], then continued the debate as follows:¹²

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read as much of this argument here as I possibly can in answer.

As for Dixon-Yates, the position of the city of Memphis has, from the outset, been clear and unequivocal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has already asked that no one under the rule be permitted to yield his time to another. Under the rules he cannot do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. The point of order is overruled.

If the gentleman from Tennessee was not speaking in opposition to the preferential motion—and it would seem to be apparent that he was debating the Dixon-Yates contract and the position of the city of Memphis—the point of order was good.

The only argument which was permissible in the situation as it was then presented was an argument in opposition to the motion to report the bill back to the House and to strike the enacting clause.

The point of order that the gentleman was not speaking on the motion was not made by me, as perhaps it should have been, but it seems to be obvious that if the gentleman was not speaking in opposition to the motion he would only be entitled to the floor to make the argument he was making under the 2 minutes to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was entitled, and which he had declared would not be yielded to another Member.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] should have been required to withdraw his objection to the yielding of time as he subsequently did, in answer to a request from the majority leader, a reference to which has just been made.

It is evident from the foregoing proceedings, as quoted, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] secured the floor in preference to the recognition of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on his statement that he rose in opposition to the motion; and thereafter, in speaking in opposition to the amendment, he yielded to the gentleman from

¹⁰ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8481.

¹¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8476.

¹² CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8476.

Tennessee [Mr. Davis], who it is apparent did not speak in opposition to the motion, nor even on the Phillips amendment, but spoke on another phase of the bill—which included many provisions other than the Dixon-Yates contract, the appropriation for the TVA.

Moreover, regardless of whether the point of order was good, or whether it was bad, I fail to find any justification for the statement of the Chairman that, when I made the point of order, I was out of order. The statement by the Chair that "The gentleman is out of order" was a gratuitous, uncalled-for observation.

READING OF PAPERS IN DEBATE

Usually in debate, either in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, when a Member has the floor he may read, without objection, his own speech or may quote from papers or documents. That is the usual, daily practice. Members, unless objection has been made, have been permitted to read either statements written by themselves or to quote from others.

However, the rule¹³ is clear and the practice^{12a} has, until the incident to

¹³ Jefferson's Manual, sec. 917, p. 485.

^{12a} Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 5, 1907:

"The first rule on this subject dates from November 13, 1794 (3d and 4th Congresses, Journal, p. 228 (Gales and Seaton edition)), when the House adopted this rule:

"When the reading of a paper is called for which has been before read to the House, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined by a vote of the House.

"As early as 1802 this rule was changed to the following form:

"When the reading of a paper is called for, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined by a vote of the House (the rule appears first in this form in the draft of the rules printed in the Journal of January 7, 1802 (1st sess., 7th Cong., Journal, p. 39, Annals; p. 410)).

"In this form the rule continued until the revision of 1880, when the present form was adopted. In their report (2d sess. 46th Cong., Record, p. 202), at that time the Committee on Rules say that they amended the old rule so as to make it applicable only to papers 'other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote,' thus reaffirming or recognizing the right of a Member to demand the reading of a paper on which he is called to vote. This is the long-established rule and practice of the English Parliament.

"5258. Under the parliamentary law every Member has the right to have a paper once read before he is called to vote on it.

"The reading of papers other than the one on which the vote is taken is usually permitted under the parliamentary law without question, but if objection is made the Speaker must take the sense of the House.

"A Member has not a right even to read his own speech, committed to writing, without leave. This also is to prevent an abuse of time, and therefore is not refused but where that is intended (2 Grey, 227)."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2602. A Member in debate usually reads or has read by the Clerk such papers as he pleases, but his privilege is subject to the authority of the House if another Member objects.

"On February 20, 1919 (3d sess., 65th Cong., Record, p. 3892), the bill (H. R. 16020) pro-

which reference will be made, been quite uniform.

But, when objection is made, then the Member should either obtain unanimous

viding deficiency appropriation for the railroads was being considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

"During general debate, Mr. Edward E. Denison, of Illinois, asked that the Clerk read in his time a press report taken from a recent issue of a Washington newspaper.

"Mr. William W. Larsen, of Georgia, objected to the reading.

"Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, argued that under the recent practice of the House objection might not be made to the reading of a paper by a Member in his own time.

"The Chairman (John N. Garner, of Texas) said:

"The objection is sustained. The present occupant of the Chair was of the opinion that the gentleman from Illinois had the right to read it in his own time, but the parliamentary clerk suggested that the rule was the other way, and he is more familiar with it than the Chair. It is very plain here in the rule as cited by the parliamentary clerk. Rule XXX is very clear on that."

"Mr. Denison himself then proposed to read the article.

"Mr. Larsen again objected, and Mr. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, moved that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to read the article in question.

"The question being taken was decided in the affirmative, and Mr. Denison read the article in the course of his remarks."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2603. Instance wherein the request of a Member to have read a paper not before the House for action encountered objection and was referred to the House.

"On January 20, 1920 (2d sess., 66th Congress, Record, p. 1782) Mr. Edward J. King, of Illinois, asked unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

"There being no objection, Mr. King sent a telegram to the desk with the request that it be read by the Clerk.

"Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, objected to the reading of the telegram.

"The Speaker (Frederick H. Gillett, of Massachusetts) said:

"It can be read by the Clerk only by unanimous consent. The gentleman objects. A Member cannot read without consent of the House."

"On motion of Mr. John I. Nolan, of California, the question was referred to the House which on a yea-and-nay vote decided, yeas 303, nays 2, that the telegram should be read."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2604. The reading of papers in debate is subject to the authority of the House, but a motion that a Member having the floor be permitted to read such papers as a part of his remarks is privileged.

"On February 10, 1931 (3d sess., 71st Congress, Record, p. 4544) during consideration of the naval appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, in the course of his remarks on the bill proposed to read a resolution passed by a post of the American Legion.

"Mr. Elliott W. Sproul, of Illinois, objected to the reading of the paper.

"Whereupon, Mr. William P. Connery, Jr., of Massachusetts, moved that Mr. Blanton be permitted to read the resolution as a part of his remarks.

"Mr. John Taber, of New York, made the point of order that the motion was not privileged.

consent, or the question should be resolved by the action of the House.

Rule XXX of the 84th Congress, section 915, page 484, provides that:

When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a

"The Chairman (Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey) ruled:

"The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to read the matter which he has indicated.

"The motion is privileged and in order (under rule XXX). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2605. The reading of papers other than the one on which the vote is taken is subject to the will of the House and any Member may object.

"Rule XXX, providing for taking the sense of the House on the reading of a paper in debate, applies also to proceedings in the Committee of the Whole.

"The rules of the House govern the Committee of the Whole insofar as applicable.

"A motion that a Member having the floor be permitted to read a paper objected to in debate is privileged.

"On January 16, 1931 (3d sess., 71st Congress, Record, p. 2377) the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union was considering the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

"During debate, Mr. John J. Boylan, of New York, began the reading of resolutions adopted by the American Federation of Labor.

"Mr. Charles L. Underhill, of Massachusetts, rose to a point of order and objected to the reading of the paper.

"The Chairman (C. William Ramseyer, of Iowa, Chairman) sustained the point of order and said:

"In order that the gentleman may read the paper he must get either unanimous consent or an affirmative vote of the House.

"There is a rule against reading a paper unless the Member gets consent to do so, Rule XXX, which reads as follows: 'When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.'"

"Thereupon, Mr. Charles R. Crisp, of Georgia, offered a motion that the gentleman be permitted to proceed with the reading of the resolutions in debate.

"Mr. William H. Stafford, of Wisconsin, raised the question of order that rule XXX admitting such motions was limited to proceedings in the House and did not apply to proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

"The Chairman ruled: 'In the opinion of the Chair, it is within the power of the Committee of the Whole House to determine whether or not it will permit a paper to be read. The point of order is overruled.'"

Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 5, 1907:

"5293. A Member may not have a report read at the Clerk's desk in his own time, if objection is made, without leave of the House; and even has been debarred from reading it himself in his place: On April 13, 1900 (1st sess., 56th Cong., Record, pp. 4136, 4137), the Committee of the Whole House was considering the bill (S. 1194) granting an increase of pension to John B. Ritzman, and Mr. W. Jasper Talbert, of South Carolina, asked to have read in his time a paper relating, not to the bill under consideration, but to the general subject of pensions.

"The Chairman (Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio, Chairman) held that this would be in order only by unanimous consent.

final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

After the point of order that the gentleman in charge of the bill, Mr. RABAUT, could not yield his time to another Member was overruled, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], to whom Mr. RABAUT had yielded and who was then addressing the House said:²⁴

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read as much of this argument here as I possibly can in answer. As for Dixon-Yates, the position of the city of Memphis has, from the outset, been clear and unequivocal.

And he then proceeded to read as a part of his own speech the letter from the mayor of Memphis.

As he read, the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan rose and made a point of order. Permit me to quote from the RECORD:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman in the well is reading his speech, which is contrary to the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to read his speech if he so desires.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am quoting from a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority by the mayor of Memphis * * *.

Is it not clear that, under the rules of the House, when the point of order was made, it was the duty of the chairman to submit to the House the question of whether the gentleman from Tennessee should be per-

mitted to read his speech and, as a part of that speech, the letter, or for the gentleman from Tennessee to ask for unanimous consent to read his speech and the letter from the mayor? I certainly would not have objected had the proper practice been followed.

Are the proceedings when the House is in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to be governed and controlled by the rules of the House and the precedents?

Or are exceptions to those rules in violation of the precedents to be made by a chairman or a speaker as his individual caprice may dictate?

That is the question which is propounded to the House.

My knowledge of the rules and of the precedents does not in any degree approach that of the Speaker, the Parliamentarian, or many Members of the House, but in my respect for the House and its proceedings, Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one.

THE DEMAND FOR THE READING OF AN ENGROSSED COPY OF A BILL²⁵

Last Thursday, June 16, 1955, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration H. R. 6766, making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.²⁶

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who had charge of the bill put on a drive to finish the bill and force its passage before the legislative day was over.

On one occasion during debate, the gentleman from Michigan, who was in charge of the bill, by motion, as previously stated, limited the time of 42 Members who desired to speak to 2 minutes each.

And what was the issue before the House? The issue was whether the Federal Government should grant the request of the Tennessee Valley Authority for some \$6,500,000 to continue and to enlarge its efforts to produce, sell, and distribute electrical energy in competition with taxpaying private interests.

The action taken by the gentleman in charge of the bill and by the leadership of the House supporting that action was dismaying.

No charge is made that one reason for the action was to continue and approve the practice of adjourning from Thursday until Monday, then scheduling for Monday no important business or votes.

That practice gives the members of the "Thursday to Tuesday Club" a 4-day recess during which they are given opportunity each weekend to leave Washington, attend to business other than as Representatives, or to reenergize themselves in delightful home surroundings.

Nor do I suggest that the bill was forced to a vote at around 7:15 Thursday evening, rather than going over to Friday or to Monday, because some members of the "Thursday to Tuesday Club" could not conveniently be in attendance.

One purpose in referring to this incident is to call to the attention of the House the fact that, if the House would stay in session on Fridays and transact

business on Mondays, we might possibly be able to adjourn this session of the Congress not later than the 4th or at the latest the middle of July. A most desirable objective, I think, if we consider the interests of the people, and certainly such adjournment is desired by an overwhelming majority of the House.

ENCOURAGING AN EARLY ADJOURNMENT

Inasmuch as the usual efforts to obtain a reasonable time for debate were unproductive, it occurred to me that if by some procedure the gentleman in charge of the bill and perhaps others could be convinced that the business of the House might be expedited by a greater consideration of the wishes of those who desired to debate an important issue, a useful purpose would be served.

The quickest arrival at a desired end is not always attained by riding roughshod over the wishes of Members desiring to debate the provisions of a bill. The Parliamentarian was advised that the reading of an engrossed copy of the bill would be demanded.

My purpose was to call the attention of the leadership to the fact that individual Members of the House, under the rules of the House, had the right to that form of procedure—that the exercise of that right might act as a brake or restraint upon hurried procedure such as was followed during Thursday.

Those attempting to force a bill through on a Thursday, then adjourn over until a Monday or a Tuesday, might take counsel from Churchill's statement, "The more haste, ever the worst speed"; or from Friar Lawrence's statement that "They stumble that run fast." Why ride a willing horse to death?

That my thought that we had had undue haste in connection with the passage of this bill was shared by others is evident from the statement made by the ranking minority Member from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. He said:

²⁴ Jefferson's Manual, sec. 831.

²⁵ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8469.

²⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8538.

decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, unless the reading in full is demanded by a Member, and the question shall then be put upon its passage.

The Parliamentarian was consulted. The precedents were examined. Some will be quoted.

When the bill came up for final consideration, I walked down the aisle to the microphone, where the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] was waiting with a motion to recommit.

Having the words of the rule in mind, I was on my feet, waiting, listening carefully, to hear the Speaker but the question, "Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?" as required by Rule XXI, or to announce, "The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill," and then to call for a vote.

Although I was within hearing distance; although I was listening attentively, I did not hear those words or their substance used, and in my opinion they were not used.

I find that the RECORD—page 8542—carries this statement:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Who ordered the bill to be engrossed? Certainly not the House, for there was no vote on that issue.

Nowhere, according to the RECORD, was I given an opportunity to demand a reading of an engrossed copy of the bill.

That the rule was not complied with, that the question was not put in the words required by the rule, seems to be borne out by the official printed RECORD, from which I again quote:²⁸

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Then the Speaker stated that the question was on the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin offered his motion to recommit. The ayes and nays were refused, the motion to recommit was rejected, and the bill was then passed on a voice vote.

It is my contention:

That rule XXI was not complied with by the statement that "The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time."

That the intent of the rule was not complied with by the statement, "The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time."

That the Representative of the Fourth Michigan District was not given an opportunity to demand the reading of an engrossed copy in accordance with the provisions of rule XXI.

If it be said that, after the amendments were agreed to, the statement of the Speaker that the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time was equivalent to the question, "Shall the

bill be engrossed and read a third time?" I call attention to the fact that, on many previous occasions, that has not been the practice.

For example, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, 1955—page 7391—when another bill was up for consideration and passage, you will find the following:

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Note the word "question" in this statement.

Before taking my place to demand the engrossment of the bill, I had, as stated, checked the rule, and I was listening carefully. Since Thursday, I have checked back and find that the House has passed a number of major bills.

On February 8, 1955—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1328—on the passage of a bill, I find that the Speaker stated the question before the House. After amendments were agreed to, the RECORD shows the following:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

That was the statement I was waiting to hear on the occasion to which reference is made.

Again, on February 18, the words of the rule were followed. The RECORD shows the following—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1794:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On February 25, on the passage of another bill, I find the following—the rule again complied with—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2180:

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On May 5, while the Speaker did not follow the words of the rule, he did announce that the question was on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5805—reads:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On January 13, the procedure was as follows—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 283:

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On March 15, the procedure was as follows—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2965:

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On March 18, the substance of the rule was followed, the procedure being—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3210:

The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Again, on March 21, the substance of the rule was followed, the RECORD stating—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3284:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On March 24, the substance of the rule again was followed. I quote—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3685:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On March 28, the RECORD shows that again we seemed to be in a hurry. It reads—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3881:

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

However, on March 30, the rule—in substance at least—was again complied with, for the RECORD shows—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4083:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

On Thursday, April 14, when the House seemed to be anxious to follow the Thursday-to-Tuesday procedure, and adjourned until Monday, April 18, the procedure was that used last Thursday, for I find—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4504:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

However, on another Thursday—May 12—the substance of the rule was followed—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6248:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

However, on another Thursday—May 19—the rule, in substance at least, was complied with—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6679:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

²⁸ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8542.

On May 24 the intent of the rule seems to have been followed, for the Speaker said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6929:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

But, on Thursday last, the RECORD does not show that the Speaker asked "Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?" Nor does it show that he put the question as to the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The RECORD shows—and this is all it shows—"The bill was engrossed and ordered to be read a third time and was read a third time."

Now, while there is no insistence that technicalities be complied with, the assertion is made that, when a Member desires an opportunity to make a request to which, under the rules, he is entitled, he should be given that opportunity.

The fact, if it be a fact, that a number of the Members desire to follow the practice of adjourning over from Thursday to Monday, with little business usually to be transacted on Monday, the House, in its discretion, can follow.

But at least those Members who might be classed as full-time Members are entitled to exercise their rights under the rules and precedents of the House. In my judgment, it might be more helpful to a larger number of the Members if we stayed here over the weekend, attended to our business, then came to an early adjournment in July.

There is another rule of the House which is disregarded. That is the rule or practice of the House which requires Members who are not present when the roll is called to qualify before voting. The practice has been for a Member to come into the Chamber after the second rollcall, if his vote be challenged, to state that he was present, listening, and did not hear his name called. That practice, to the minds of those who, sitting in the gallery, witness the procedure, brings discredit not only upon Members, but upon the House itself.

So far as I have been able to learn, that rule serves no useful purpose, except possibly to prevent a third, fourth, or other calling by the Clerk of the names of absent Members. The rule should be repealed or at least modified.

It is my hope that my colleagues will, with charity and patience, bear with me if at times I appear aggressive in attempting to obtain for myself or my colleagues privileges and rights granted by the rules.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE in two instances.

Mr. HESELTON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST in explanation of a bill he introduced at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and include a letter from former Secretary of Welfare Hobby and an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST in explanation of two bills he has introduced.

Mr. GENTRY.

Mr. DOYLE, notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be \$380.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas to revise and extend his remarks made in committee on the highway bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to revise and extend his remarks made in committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. GWINN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AVERY (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE), for Monday, July 25, 1955, on account of official business for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 463. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1194. An act to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska, and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, as units of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point Terminal and Ammunition Loading Pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1683. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1689. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them

by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2432. An act to permit the use in the coastwise trade of the barge *Irrigon*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2513. An act to authorize the sale of Welles Village war housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the Housing Authority of the town of Glastonbury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2755. An act for the relief of Benjamin Johnson;

H. R. 2783. An act for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang;

H. R. 2944. An act for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball;

H. R. 2947. An act for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 2972. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

H. R. 3048. An act for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Arsenia;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulos;

H. R. 3625. An act for the relief of George Vourderis;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista;

H. R. 3786. An act to incorporate the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America;

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufeld;

H. R. 3871. An act for the relief of Orville Ennis;

H. R. 4044. An act for the relief of Bural Lyden and others;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Adelheid (Heldi) Glessner (nee Schega);

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray;

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4280. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands;

H. R. 4284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco;

H. R. 4289. An act for the relief of Vladislav Bevc;

H. R. 4362. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Christa Harkrader;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Duncan McQuagge;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4727. An act to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin;

H. R. 4747. An act to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5283. An act for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki;

H. R. 5875. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6277. An act to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station;

H. R. 6396. An act for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson;

H. R. 6613. An act for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi;

H. R. 6980. An act providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority;

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel;

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day; and

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 473. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 605. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl;

H. R. 932. An act for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz);

H. R. 1180. An act for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson;

H. R. 1185. An act for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar;

H. R. 1302. An act for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of Mother Amata (Marie Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale), and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffro);

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Paul Compagnino;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Ervin Benedikt;

H. R. 1439. An act for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kallsz;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Frank Budman;

H. R. 1698. An act for the relief of Anne Cheng;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schwaalm;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens;

H. R. 1987. An act for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall;

H. R. 1997. An act for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo;

H. R. 2059. An act for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Maria de Rehinder;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner;

H. R. 2313. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas;

H. R. 2735. An act for the relief of Inakoo Yokoo and her minor child;

H. R. 2738. An act for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic; and

H. R. 2749. An act for the relief of George Risto Divitkos.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 27, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1031. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1032. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, relative to the following publications: Typical Electric Bills, 1955, and Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Publicly Owned, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1033. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment in civilian position in the White House Office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1034. A letter from the Deputy for Legislative Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1035. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Benjamin Buchanan for the purposes of operating a marina in the Kettle Falls area of Coulee Dam National Recreation Park, Washington, for a period of 8 months, from May 1, 1955, to December 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1036. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Drs. Alfred M. Lueck and John A. Pearson, which will, when executed by the Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, on behalf of the Government, authorize them to provide a medical, hospital, and dental service for the public in Yellowstone National Park during the term of 1 year from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1037. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting a report on Federal Tort Claims paid for the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to 28 United States Code 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1038. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a supplemental report on the operations of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government for the year prior to November 1, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1039. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on contempt proceeding against John J. Gojack; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 157. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security (Rept. No. 1407). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5948. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by prohibiting the acquisition of assets of other banks by banks, banking associations, or trust companies when the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly; with amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5055. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service Academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5516. A bill to amend section 306 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6622. A bill for the relief of certain rural carriers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6634. A bill to provide for the conveyance of 1.8 acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage-disposal purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7121. A bill to validate payments of mileage made to United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress, 1st session, on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices against retail gasoline operators by oil-company suppliers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 3084. A bill to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of political activities to make them inapplicable to State officers and employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1051. An act to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2253. An act to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2383. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventive Contributions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2430. A bill to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6725. A bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for Reserve officers who are involuntarily released from active duty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6309. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; with amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2619. A bill to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4668. A bill to amend section 4021 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5647. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on motorcycles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 7245. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHATHAM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2097. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; with amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6808. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Red River and its tributaries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 317. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; without

amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schlegel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7114. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane; with amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Regina Dippold; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5913. A bill for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu); without amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6363. A bill for the relief of Edward Barnett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6741. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5866. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; with amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritsells); with amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Edward Neal Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Barsa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5285. A bill for the relief of the Imperial Agricultural Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5533. A bill for the relief of John C. Walsh; with amendment (Rept. No. 1430).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6452. A bill for the relief of William H. Foley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 42. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who loses her widow's benefit by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7596. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7597. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of employees of the United States Government for gratuity, holiday, or overtime compensation during the period covered by World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 7598. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County, Fla.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 7599. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7600. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 7601. A bill to restore to the rolls certain emergency officers heretofore granted retirement pay; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7602. A bill to provide deductions for gifts to nonprofit voluntary health insurance plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 7603. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 7604. A bill amending section 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, relating to the privilege of the members of the Commission on Atomic Energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 7605. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 7606. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 7607. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7608. A bill to improve the health of the people by encouraging the financing of construction of licensed nursing homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7609. A bill to exempt fine-arts programs from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 7610. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7611. A bill to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 7612. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Harrisville Consolidated School District, Alcona County, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 7613. A bill to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the upper division of the Baker project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 7614. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the military department concerned shall employ and provide counsel qualified to practice in such foreign court, to aid in the defense of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is accused of a crime and is to be tried in a foreign court; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7615. A bill to facilitate and expedite the making of minimum-wage determinations and other determinations and interpretations by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 7616. A bill to extend the authority contained in the act of September 3, 1954, for the admission of certain skilled alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7617. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7618. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7619. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of

the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7620. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 7621. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for grants to State health agencies to assist Hill-Burton hospitals in providing food for their patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7622. A bill to provide for a suitable and distinctive lapel button which may be worn by veterans of the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 7623. A bill to amend section 1, section 6, section 7, and the title of Public Law 463, 81st Congress (ch. 72, 2d sess.), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 407. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 409. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 29, 1956, through February 4, 1956, as National Junior Achievement Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 316. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring the amending of the Refugee Relief Act along the lines recommended by the President to the present session of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7624. A bill for the relief of Cynthia W. Y. Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Ursula Gerlinde Reinhardt Meinz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Viola Grace Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 7627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Halbrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7628. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the White House Office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

358. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 30 residents of Mason City, Iowa, and vicinity favoring legislation to finance the costs of public highway construction on a pay-as-you-go basis; also favoring limiting the size and weight of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works.

359. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francisco Valle and others, Hatillo, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing the bill providing for increasing to \$100 the pension to be received by each one of us—being veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Invitation to Sponsors of North Atlantic Treaty To Name Delegates to a Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement made by me yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12, JULY 25, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to this committee for your consideration in scheduling hearings today on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. If adopted in its present form this resolution would provide for the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a convention for the purpose of exploring means of further unity among the democracies.

As the committee knows, I was joined in offering this resolution by Senators FLANDERS,

HUMPHREY, JACKSON, LEHMAN, LONG, MANSFIELD, McNAMARA, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PAYNE, SCOTT, and SPARKMAN. I believe that my fellow sponsors would also join me in urging the committee to make any changes in the language in the resolution which you deem necessary in order to better define or make more precise its purposes. For instance, it is my understanding that the executive departments concerned may propose that the language be changed to have the invitation of the President issued on behalf of the Congress. Such a change would certainly be satisfactory with me and is in fact in keeping with our own constitutional history. The important thing is that we take a step now which the times demand and make such a convention possible.

The President's meeting at the summit emphasizes, in my opinion, the desirability of the step here proposed. In line with our own history of freedom in the United States and the comparable histories of freedom among our fellow democracies, these meetings of the heads of state serve to emphasize the desirability of meetings also among representatives of the people themselves.

We need now a meeting after the summit—a meeting of the sovereigns—a meeting of the people themselves from whom, under the democratic theory of government, all power derives.

I believe it to be significant that during the past few months an increasing number of the world's leaders have endorsed the plan here proposed. I have here the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Defense, and former Chief of Staff which I think is of sufficient importance to read in its entirety:

"A few days before the death of Justice Owen J. Roberts, I accepted his invitation of May 5 to become a member of the Council of the Atlantic Union Committee which he has

headed since its foundation in 1949. In accepting, I wrote him May 12:

"I am honored to be counted among those who support the unity of free nations."

"Justice Roberts' services to defense as well as to the judiciary were manifold, but perhaps the finest thing he did was the sacrifice he made in resigning from the Supreme Court to devote himself to the cause of Atlantic Union."

"The subject today is vitally important and the period fateful. All probably agree to the importance of Atlantic unity but few act."

"Recently a resolution calling for action was introduced in Congress by a distinguished bipartisan group from both Houses. It proposes that delegates from the United States and other NATO democracies meet in a convention to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union." This prudent proposal, which commits us only to exploration, deserves support.

"Thinking back on the development of our own Federal Union—on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the colonies, on the remarkable advance in freedom, invention, production, and living standards which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to maintain their individual personality and institutions—Americans should have a sympathetic understanding of this effort to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common problems."

"What I said when I addressed the conference of governors on July 14, 1947, I would repeat today: 'There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the Old World.'